DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 691 UD 018 953

AUTHOR Flores, Juan
TITLE The Insular Vision: Pedreira's Interpretation of Puerto Rican Culture. Centro Working Papers.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Centro de Estudios Pertorriguenos.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 109p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Background; *Cultural Factors; *Ethnicity; *Literature Reviews; *Puerto Rican Culture; *Puerto Ricans; *Social History; Spanish Culture
IDENTIFIERS Ortega y Gasset (Jose); *Pedreira (Antonio S)

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to assess and provide an understanding of many aspects of Puerto Rican culture in the United States and in Puerto Rico, this document contains a detailed critical treatment of Antonio S. Pedreira's "Insularismo: Ensayos de interpretacion puertorriquena." Described as being the single most influential study of Puerto Rican culture since its publication in 1934, "Insularismo" is both lauded and criticized for its views on Puerto Rican national identity and its analysis of Puerto Rican history. Examples are cited to illustrate Pedreira's disdain for the popular, indigenous roots of Puerto Rican culture. The book's structure is briefly analyzed to show Pedreira's lack of scientific thinking about man and society. Its tone is described as an echo of the "Arielist" movement that swept the Spanish speaking intellectual world in the early 20th century which was elitist, individualistic, and rhetorical. References are made to other scholars and writings for comparative purposes and specifically to the influence that Ortego y Gasset, Spengler and prevailing trends of Latin American cultural theory had on Pedreira's writing. (EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164691

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTRO

WORKING PAPERS

DEC 13 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños

UD018953

Copyright ©, RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 1978

APRENDER A LUCHAR

LUCHAR ES APRENDER

CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS PUERTORRIQUENOS 445 W. 59th St.; New York, N.Y. 10019 Tel.: (212) 489-5260

THE INSULAR VISION: PEDREIRA'S INTERPRETATION OF PUERTO RICAN CULTURE

1

Juan Flores - Culture Task Force

New York, January 1978

Contents

	Page
New Contexts, New Readings	1
The Metaphor of National Identity: Isolation and Becility	6
Puerto Rican History: Contours and Contortions	13
The Culture of the Conquest: Enlightenment or Alienation?	21
Continuities of Popular Culture	32
From Hispanism to Racism	42
"Arielismo" and the Recourse to Latinity	51
"Si Ortega y Gasset fuera puertorriqueño..."	59
The Spengler Vogue: Culture vs. Civilization	66
Insularismo: Interpretation or Projection?	77
Concluding Remarks: New Readings, New Tasks	87
Notes	93

New Contexts, New Readings

The wholesale exportation of working-class families from Puerto Rico to the United States carries a social and cultural impact of significant proportions. The massive presence of Puerto Ricans in New York and other urban centers and rural pockets, serving on ready reserve at all levels of the labor process, has introduced a new dimension to class and national contention not only in the United States and Puerto Rico, but throughout the Americas. The cliché of Puerto Ricans as a "bridge between two cultures" was coined in a reactionary, assimilationist spirit, to suggest the convenient marriage of that age-old mythical pair, Anglo-Saxon materialism and Latin spirituality; or, in its more pertinent, "commonwealth" version, the neighborly co-existence of the benevolent, self-sufficient colossus and that helpless speck of tropical subculture. Such "bridges," of course, are no more than imperialist wish-dreams, invidious constructs intended to conceal and legitimize the real relations between North American and Puerto Rican societies.

Yet in the deeper historical sense, Puerto Ricans in the United States do indeed generate new linkages. Cultural interactions and exchanges with Black people in the United States are clearly the most prominent but only one in a growing array. Contact with peoples from

other Caribbean and Latin American countries-- in New York -- and San Francisco-- and with Mexicans and Mexican-Americans --in Detroit, Chicago and Los Angeles --is becoming increasingly significant. Less apparent and highly complex associations with working-class Americans of Italian, Irish and other European descent also bear mention. The quality of these various cross-currents differs greatly, of course, depending most of all on the relative position historically of the interacting peoples and cultures within the expanding network of world imperialism and its projections within the United States. If the main design of the dominant culture is assimilation, the enforced melting-down of genuine cultural diversity, the most telling effect of the Puerto Rican cultural presence in the United States remains its emphasis on difference, and most notably on the distinction between cultures of colonial peoples and that of imperialist society. It is that core of resistance and self-affirmation that makes the Puerto Rican case so deeply revealing of the true content of newly furbished ideologies of pluralism for the colonized, whether at home or in the heart of the metropolis. In this sense, the Puerto Rican experience is indeed a link spanning outward toward the cultures of all the Americas and the colonial world.

The Puerto Rican presence in the United States does inject a stream of anti-colonial, Latin American and Caribbean culture into the artery of North American life and, conversely, it has projected the development

of Puerto Rican cultural history into a setting of intense multi-cultural interactions, both events unprecedented, in the senses described, within the history of either society. But as long as Puerto Rico remains in direct colonial bondage to the United States, Puerto Rican cultural expression in the United States evokes the relation, above all, between Puerto Rican people here and there, between the expressive life of the migrant population and the long-standing traditions of struggle and articulation of the Island culture. Whatever else is said about the cultural activity of Puerto Ricans in the United States, critical analysis will inevitably and ultimately hinge on the explanation given to the continuities and interruptions between cultural life in the new setting and its most relevant historical backdrop, the Puerto Rican national culture.

Recognition of this national referent, however, does not by itself guarantee the accuracy and appropriateness of an interpretation of the cultural experience of Puerto Ricans in the United States. The most noteworthy and representative attempts to describe the culture in this setting, in fact, operate within just such a frame, steering clear of both overtly assimilationist and abstractly cosmopolitan positions and drawing many lines of comparison and contrast to the Island legacy. Yet despite their proper attention to identifiable national links, all of these approaches fall short, for different reasons, of a coherent and theoretically elaborated presentation of the problem. In all their

diversity, the major commentators on Puerto Rican culture in its United States manifestations have recourse to a similarly static and fragmentary conception of cultural development. Considered individually and in conjunction, they project a confused and disorienting image of the cultural situation of Puerto Ricans in the United States.[1]

Now these theoretical deficiences, and the major issues and concerns involved in the cultural identification of Puerto Ricans now in the United States, are rooted in the cumulated tradition of philosophical self-definition on the part of Island-based Puerto Rican thinkers. A critical review of some of the more widely recognized "classical" conceptions and misconceptions of Puerto Rican national identity, therefore, may identify the range of discourse concerning the cultural reality of Puerto Rican people living in the United States. To this day, despite intervening deep-going social changes and numerous subsequent attempts to delineate the national character and culture, Antonio S. Pedreira's Insularismo: Ensayos de interpretación puertorriqueña stands since its publication in 1934, as the main watershed and germinal source of thinking about Puerto Rican culture. For this reason, and because the book has never received adequate intellectual scrutiny, detailed critical treatment of Insularismo is crucial to an assessment of the cultural life of Puerto Rican people, whether in Puerto Rico or in the United States.

At the same time, it is to be hoped that the vantage-point provided by active interest and involvement in the current cultural production

and political struggle of Puerto Ricans in New York City may help shed some fresh light on these deep-lying yet broadly contested assumptions. The process of intensive capitalist industrialization and the tidal-wave of migration, which cast up nearly half of the Puerto Rican working class in North American ghettos, constitutes the main historical development separating Pedreira's time from the present. The cultural ferment to which that movement has led, the probing search for a critical, Puerto Rican perspective on their own production by cultural workers in this new setting, are the unforeseen events which confront Pedreira's vision. The powerfully disturbing paintings of Jorge Soto, the varied poetic voices of Pedro Pietri, Sandy Esteves and Victor Hernández Cruz, the stark yet vibrant dramatic experiments of Teatro 4, the important innovations in the music of Eddie Palmieri and popular ensembles of the last decade -- compelling evidence of the manifold cultural experience of Puerto Rican people -- escape interpretation within the cramped intellectual horizons of Insularismo.[2]

The Metaphor of National Identity: Isolation and Docility

In 1644, the hey-day of Spanish colonial rule, the Bishop of Puerto Rico, Damián López de Haro, offered one of the very few available descriptions of conditions on the Island at the time. Among the realities which came to his attention, and which he recorded in rather sarcastic tones in a letter to Juan Díaz de la Calle "con una relación muy curiosa sobre su viaje y otras cosas," the Bishop made note of the dire poverty of Puerto Rico and the general state of terror caused by ceaseless acts of plunder on the part of Dutch pirates at large in the Caribbean. "Aquí estamos tan sitiados de enemigos," he wrote, "que no se atreven (los puertorriqueños) a salir a pescar en un barco, porque luego los coge el holandés." (161)[3]

This portrait of a people forced into confinement and isolation from even their most immediate surroundings and insulated, as it were, from the inimical world outside, hangs with symbolic import over the entire history of Puerto Rico. It is this description by Bishop López de Haro, in fact, which forms the metaphorical crux of the single most influential study of Puerto Rican culture: Insularismo: Ensayos de interpretación puertorriqueña (1934). Its author, Antonio S. Pedreira, had all the credentials necessary to undertake such a broad-reaching theoretical meditation on the "character" and cultural "personality" of the Puerto Rican people. Virtually every modern Puerto Rican writer and critic of

any prominence -- Tomás Blanco, Vicente Geigel-Polanco, Emilio S. Belaval, Enrique Laguerre, Concha Meléndez, María Teresa Babín, Francisco Manrique Cabrera, José Antonio Dávila, Evaristo Rivera Chevremont, Washington Lloréns, Samuel R. Quiñones, Margot Arce de Vázquez, José A. Balseiro, Felix Franco Oppenheimer, to name a few - have paid explicit homage to Pedreira's paramount contribution. He was also praised highly by none other than Gabriela Mistral, who said of him "gente hostosiana es ella," and by Juan Ramón Jiménez in a letter to Margot Arce de Vázquez at the time of his death. In the only extended discussion of Insularismo to date, Manuel Maldonado-Denis singled out that book as "el clásico por excelencia de interpretación puertorriqueña."[4] With little hesitation, Pedreira may be considered the father of modern Puerto Rican letters.

Born in the traumatic year 1898, Pedreira emerged as a budding "post-modernist" poet and was active in university student affairs in the early 1920s. In addition to travels to Spain and the European countries, he did his graduate work under Federico de Onís at Columbia University, receiving his degree in 1927 for a thesis on Eugenio María de Hostos. On returning to the Island, he was named the first director of the Department of Hispanic Studies at the University of Puerto Rico. Aside from his teaching and directing activities, he was one of the co-founders, in 1929, of the journal Indice, which immediately became one of the most important forums of Puerto Rican intellectual debate.

His critical and academic writings broke major ground in a wide range of areas of Puerto Rican cultural history; a mere listing of his works may suggest the scope of his contribution: De los nombres de Puerto Rico (1927), Arista (1930), Hostos, ciudadano de América (1932), La actualidad del jíbaro (1935), El año terrible del '87 (1937), Un hombre del pueblo: José Celso Barbosa (1937), El periodismo en Puerto Rico (1941) and the compilation of his articles for El Mundo, Aclaraciones y crítica. This legacy of pioneering studies, and especially his major work Insularismo, has marked the standard and the philosophical tone for all Puerto Rican cultural interpretation since his death in 1939.[5]

Pedreira sets the Puerto Ricans' fear of the Dutchman into the sweeping trajectory of colonial isolation and subjugation. The particular historical fate of the Island, having been passed from one imperial orbit to another and falling prey to whatever greedy and aggressive designs lurk in the Antilles, has served to accentuate the already restrictive effect of its diminutive, "insular" geography. Unending dread of invasion and political answerability to foreign metropolitan powers -- total absence of national sovereignty -- have forced Puerto Rican culture into a prostrate, submissive position, sealed off from all interchange and solidarity with other peoples. At the same time, Pedreira emphasizes the spirit of resistance and the struggle for self-identification which constitute the real quality of Puerto Rican history; his chapter "Afirmación puertorriqueña" is undoubtedly among the most moving, eloquent words of

homage to the 19th-century independence movement in all of Puerto Rican writing, and is in large measure responsible for the book's influence on subsequent progressive approaches to Puerto Rican history. Pedreira calls upon his compatriots -- and knows it is within their power -- to break out of their isolation and overcome their fear of the threatening pirate who, he observes, "has not always been a Dutchman" (no siempre ha sido de nacionalidad holandesa). "Para que el mundo nos conozca y nos potencie hay que dejar de ser Robinson Crusoe. Salgamos a pescar, aunque nos coja el holandés. ¡Puede que alguien regrese un día con las redes llenas!"(163)

Yet the sense of affirmation pronounced by Pedreira runs deeper than evidence of political history; the real attraction of the book is that it poses the problem at a philosophical, ontological level. Insularismo was written to crown a debate among Puerto Rican intellectuals of those years, a debate consisting of responses solicited in 1929 by the editors of Indice to the agonizing question of national identity --"¿qué y cómo somos?" The issue had been raised many years earlier, in the wake of North American occupation, in the famous words of Rosendo Matienzo Cintrón (1903): "Hoy, Puerto Rico sólo es una muchedumbre pero cuando la muchedumbre puertorriqueña tenga un alma, entonces Puerto Rico será una patria." The immediate spark for the contemporary debate, however, was the comment by the official Puerto Rican historian Mariano Abril in 1929: "Pero...¿existe el alma? ¿y puertorriqueña? Un cirujano no la encontraría con el escalpelo, un psicólogo dudaría. El país está desquiciado...se asemeja a aquel caballero de la

muerte pintados por el gran Durero, que ocultaba tras la armadura reluciente un esqueleto ruin." (167) While avoiding the crass and morbid imagery of Mariano Abril, most of the respondents to Indice tend to deny the existence of a Puerto Rican "soul" or unmistakable mode of being, and cast their national characterizations in extremely negative, demeaning terms.

Pedreira allowed himself several years of reflection and study to formulate his contribution to this discussion, knowing that the clinical and pseudo-scientific terms in which the question was being framed could not possibly lead to an adequate answer. His conclusion, in Insularismo, is qualified, but can leave no doubt as to the existence of a Puerto Rican national spirit: "Nosotros creemos, honradamente, que existe el alma puertorriqueña disgregada, dispersa, en potencia, luminosamente fragmentada, como un rompecabezas doloroso que no ha gozado nunca de su integralidad."(168) The national psyche is in formation, he contends, and despite the many historical obstacles and contradictions there is a definite Puerto Rican personality. It is this affirmation, however conditional, of national identity, and the evident circumspection and intellectual attention paid to its definition, which account for the germinal significance of Pedreira's book for subsequent cultural study. From this point onward it could no longer be said of Puerto Rico that it lacked the kind of self-interpretative essay enjoyed by most of the other Latin American countries. Insularismo put Puerto Rico on the intellectual map, and lent its claim to nationhood, however belated and mimetic, a measure of authority and, one might add, respectability.

Yet this spiritual recognition and patriotic homage is about all there is by way of national affirmation, and seems to have been purchased at the price of attributing to the Puerto Rican people, as inherent national traits, all the symptoms of colonial rule. In Pedreira's judgment, Puerto Ricans are a characteristically weak, complacent, ignorant and confused people, with a penchant for rhetorical excess, plagued by fits of lyrical melancholia, and cowardly and passive in the face of adversity. The isolation represented by the fear of Dutch pirates is generalized as a lack of solidarity with other peoples and of intellectual and cultural achievements matching up to international standards; the peaceful, non-violent nature of the people, presented as a singular Puerto Rican virtue, is then inverted at a more speculative level of thinking into weakness of will and a deficient sense of collective determination.

The catch-word, of course, is docility or, in its more "native" idiomatic version, "aplatanamiento." As Pedreira defines this national condition, "Aplatanarse, en nuestro país, es una especie de inhibición, de modorra mental y ausencia de acometividad. Es seguir, sin sofocarse, cómoda y rutinariamente, el curso de la vida, sin cambios ni inquietudes, cabeceando nuestras aspiraciones y en cuclillas frente al porvenir."(39) Puerto Ricans are typically and collectively on their haunches, "ñangotado," according to Pedreira, who makes no note of the attribution of precisely the same identifying pose to other peoples, notably the Mexican peasantry.

And in describing Puerto Rican society as sick and without motivation, Pedreira is only giving classical stature to similar observations made by earlier Puerto Rican intellectuals, such as Luis Muñoz Rivera in his poems and proclamations and Manuel Zeno Gandía in his four-part novel series entitled "Crónica de un mundo enfermo." What is perhaps most important, however, is that Pedreira handed this tradition on to more recent portrayals of the Puerto Rican character, not only among North American anthropologists, but among some of the country's outstanding contemporary writers, such as José Luis González in his prose sketch "La carta" and Rene Marqués in what might be regarded as a sequel essay to Insularismo: the award-winning "El puertorriqueño dócil."(1962)[6]

The value of Insularismo in developing a critique of this generic attribution is its pivotal position within an extended controversy, but also derives from the fact that Pedreira more than anyone attempts to account for this collective trait by probing to the roots of the national "essence" and tracing its development through the centuries. Getting out from under the Puerto Ricans' most burdensome, typological cliché involves most evidently in this case, therefore, a total recasting of historical vision, a radical reinterpretation of the meaning of ethnicity, and an abandonment of outworn theories and methods of analysis. Insularismo, and above all its theoretical and practical repudiation, projects the issue of Puerto Rican culture and identity into the broadest of arenas, science and world politics. This expansion of horizon is made all the more indispensable by the momentous historical developments -- rapid industrialization, massive migration and changes in political status -- since the book's appearance in 1934.

In Pedreira's view, Puerto Rico is in the third major stage of its historical development. "Yo veo tres momentos supremos en el desarrollo de nuestro pueblo: el primero, de formación y acumulación pasiva, que empieza con el descubrimiento y la conquista y termina en los últimos años del siglo XVIII y primeros del XIX; el segundo, de despertar e iniciación, que empalma con el anterior y cierra con la guerra hispanoamericana y el tercero, de indecisión y transición en que estamos."(15) Pedreira is confident about the accuracy of this periodization, and at times presents his vision in the poetic images of a seafaring voyage: "Tres siglos de callada y lenta navegación no fueron suficientes para encontrar la ruta de El Dorado. En el siglo XIX empezamos a vislumbrar, entre la bruma, las costas de nuestra conciencia colectiva y cuando nos preparábamos para el grito jubiloso de ¡Patria a la vista!, una mano guerrera nos quebrantó el timón, quedando nuestra nave al garete."(168) Puerto Rican history begins, then, with the Spanish conquest, and after three centuries of gestation and gradual differentiation from Spain, the process of national self-definition accelerates with the advance of the 19th century, only to be brought to an abrupt halt under the North American occupation since 1898. In the 20th century, with Puerto Rican culture being saturated

by foreign, "Anglo-Saxon" values, the society is considered to be in a state of confusion and "transition," and its movement toward national consciousness derailed.

This conventional panorama of national history, as helpful as it is in its indication of general contours, actually serves to obscure and distort the most salient features of national self-definition. Most obviously, the point of departure is taken to be the arrival of European conquerors, such that the cultures and struggles of pre-Columbian times are assumed to have no bearing on subsequent development. Because of its rapid extinction at the hands of the invaders, the indigenous population is dismissed summarily as a component of national identity; all that the Tainos contributed, after the Christian baptism of the Island, were some quaint folkloristic remnants like the "bohío" and the hammock. This deletion of the Indians from the historical record and diminution of their enduring cultural significance are earmarks of a colonialist frame of thinking. Though largely corrected by the subsequent anthropological work of Ricardo Alegría, Eugenio Fernández Méndez and José Juan Arrom, this relegation of the indigenous heritage or, what is but the logical converse, its romanticized mystique, continues to blur any scientific account of Puerto Rican history.[7]

It is true, of course, that compared to countries like Mexico and Perú, Bolivia and Guatemala, Indian presence as a social force during the forging of modern Puerto Rican life is negligible; there are no living

Indian languages or forms of social organization, no Indianist literature and therefore no Indian participation in any of the formative struggles of modern history. For that reason, any claim to the effect that Puerto Ricans are "essentially" Tainos or endeavor to trace the national culture to Indian "spirit," divorced from what can be determined or reliably presumed to have been the mode of social organization of the indigenous tribes, leads inevitably to a mystified and reductionist escape. However, the extermination of the Indian population and relative extinction of cultural remains in no way justify the exclusion of an indigenous, "primitive" perspective from the trajectory of Puerto Rican cultural history.

Even Pedreira, in fact, cannot totally ignore this dimension of the struggle for national self-definition. In the course of his enthusiastic homage to the 19th-century independence movement, he calls to mind the "first Puerto Rican to speak valiantly and clearly of separatism,"(179) the poet Daniel de Rivera. In 1854, a Ponce newspaper published Rivera's poem "Agueybana el bravo," in which the demand for independence -- "que parta a España el que nació en España" and "libre esta perla de la gente ibera" -- is uttered through the persona of the Indian chieftain who led the earliest resistance against the conquistadores. As has become well known, this publication led to the immediate suppression of the periodical, confiscation of the press, and to the persecution and conclusive exile of the poet. Pedreira goes on to document the powerful

political impact of the poem in the famous Manifesto of 1864 put out by the Puerto Rican soldiers who chose to desert the Spanish colonial army rather than fight their brothers in Santo Domingo. "Los jíbaros de Puerto Rico," the proclamation reads, "hijos de Agueybana, el Bravo, no han perdido aún la vergüenza y sabrán probar a sus verdugos, como lo están haciendo los valientes dominicanos, que si son fáciles de gobernar mientras creen que se les hace justicia, no sufren que se abuse de ellos impunemente." In what is the strongest note of internationalist solidarity in the pages of Insularismo, Pedreira summarizes the meaning of this "Indian" perspective: "El nombre de este indio, el primero en sublevarse contra los conquistadores, se convirtió entonces en símbolo de redención, con un orgullo provocador nos proclamamos altivamente hijos de Agueybana, el Bravo, y al par que guerra a los españoles se predicaban a grito herido sentimientos de solidaridad antillana."(179)

Yet such passages are rare in Pedreira's writing, and only feebly contradict his markedly Hispanic conception of Puerto Rican identity. At no point does he go beyond a symbolic and more or less rhetorical reference to the indigenous background, or show any interest in probing the deeper strains of continuity between Indian and later, national forms of resistance to colonial oppression. Puerto Rican history is, in his view, no more than a process of differentiation, almost regional in character, within the orbit of Spanish history, a movement from an initial state of "faithful prolongation" of Iberian culture and values to a

growing conflict between Spaniards "de allá" and Spaniards "de acá." Needless to say, Pedreira's allegiance to Spain, like that of so many Latin American Hispanophiles, really betrays a selective loyalty, since it highlights only the patrimonial, feudal legacy of Spanish culture. The progressive and revolutionary traditions of modern Spain, which were assuming powerful visible expression in the very years of Insularismo and have such a strong potential bearing on the cultural struggle throughout Latin America, find no repercussions whatever in Pedreira's writing.[8]

This "criollo" vision, so common among Puerto Rican intellectuals when confronted with the reality of North American cultural imposition, leads Pedreira to a variety of Eurocentric distortions. He notes with remorse, for example, that Puerto Rican history lacks its Middle Ages and Renaissance, as though these periods inevitably befall all societies and are yet to "arrive" in Puerto Rico before it can attain to its full cultural realization. He summarily writes off the "first three centuries" -- the 16th, 17th and 18th -- as "mar muerto," "siglos en blanco" and "un desesperante desierto cultural," (52-3) implying that all artistic activity must be measured against the "Siglo de Oro" and that there can have been no cultural life but that of the chronicles and memoirs of the Spanish missionaries.[9]

Even in his account of the cherished 19th century, the period of real national awakening, Pedreira points to the triumph of liberalism in

Spain, rather than to the Latin American independence struggles, as the direct impetus of democratic movement. In a similar spirit, he considers the abolitionist literature of the Island and Spain and not the waves of slave rebellions to have been the backbone of social reform, and the repression of illustrious liberals like Ramón Baldorioty de Castro and the Spaniard Laureano Cepeda in the "año terrible 1887" of more "transcendent" historical importance than the "llamada revolución de Lares." It is significant that in his forceful heralding of Puerto Rican national affirmation, the names Betances and Hostos are mentioned only in passing, and that while Alonso's El Gíbaro is enthroned as the Poema del Cid and Martín Fierro of Puerto Rican literature, and similar stress is placed on the romantic lyrics of José Gautier Benítez, there is little attention given to the critical, realistic novels of Zeno Gandía or to the revolutionary poetry of "Pachín" Marín. Pedreira did, of course, devote a full monograph to Hostos ("Ciudadano de América"), but here too his Hispanophile, anti-indigenous bias prevails, as is most evident in his nearly total disregard for Hostos' diary novel La peregrinación de Bayoán (1863) -- his only work of fiction -- and the deep personal and political crisis it represented.

Small wonder, then, that Pedreira comes to characterize the 20th century as an "intermezzo," a "transition" period in which the ship of Puerto Rican history is "adrift" ("la nave al garete"). Here all sense of historical actuality, dim as it is throughout Insularismo, gives way to the

metaphysical dualism of contrasting "estilos de vida": "De una polarización europea pasamos sin sentirlo a una polarización norte-americana."(96) Spain having been the sole center of gravity of Puerto Rican national formation, the complete social occupation of the Island by the United States -- extending, be it noted, to the imposition of English in the schools -- is regarded by thinkers like Pedreira as an "interruption" of that process, the implication being that the colony will in the future somehow return to its true path of interaction with Spanish culture. Over against North American utilitarianism, progress and democracy, Pedreira calls upon Puerto Rico to uphold the legacy of Christian spirituality, profundity and elitist grace inherited from its Spanish patrimonial past.

This polarity, which is summarized in the familiar opposition between "culture" and "civilization," is of course not Pedreira's invention, but merely the Puerto Rican version of the central cliché of Latin American cultural nationalism and reactionary European cultural pessimism. It is best, therefore, to consider these more contemporary reflections of Insularismo in their relation to the theories of José Enrique Rodó, José Vasconcelos, José Ortega y Gasset and Oswald Spengler, these being the thinkers who stand as the evident sources of Pedreira's analytical method and broader philosophical orientation. These influential and wide-ranging intellectual currents bear most directly, of course, on Pedreira's response to conditions in the 20th century, and are appropriately

assessed in that context. Filling in the background to a rounded ideological placement, however, calls first for a critical review of his assumptions about some enduring issues central to an interpretation of Puerto Rican cultural history: the meaning of the Spanish conquest, the relation of print to oral culture, and the role of racial and environmental determinism in legitimizing colonial subordination.

The Culture of the Conquest: Enlightenment or Alienation?

There is a deeper dimension to the discounting of indigenous origins and the Latinized conception of national identity which, while given classical formulation in Insularismo, continue to find currency in even the most progressive and anthropologically grounded correctives to this frame of thinking. At this level, the very meaning of the concepts of culture, progress and civilization come into question, and the distinction between a conservative and a revolutionary interpretation of social development assumes discernible theoretical significance. The question is not whether or not there existed a pre-Columbian cultural world nor the bearing of these cultures on the society after the conquest, since these realities have been and continue to be documented, and in reference to Puerto Rico had by Pedreira's time already been recorded by early Puerto Rican historians such as Salvador Brau and Cayetano Coll y Toste, and by the North American anthropologist Jesse Walter Fewkes as early as 1903. In recent years, Eugenio Fernández Méndez has contributed a valuable overview and economic periodization of Indian society and European colonization in his Historia cultural de Puerto Rico (1970). Unfortunately, his presentation remains quite eclectic and arbitrary, ranging from far-flung Kantian abstractions to rather tedious and arbitrary compendia. What is needed is a systematic historical study of social production before and after the conquest, and a dialectical

interpretation of the resulting ideological and cultural transformations. Marxist methods are clearly indispensable to a satisfactory account of cultural colonialism even in precapitalist epochs.

What, then, did Spain actually bring to the "New World" by way of a cultural superstructure understood in its broadest sense? The task is to define the nature of the "civilizing" European influence and the cultural content of the collision between the Spanish conquerors and the native societies in such a way as to comprehend the fundamental continuity between classical European colonialism and North American imperialism. There can be perhaps no more suggestive a starting-point for this manner of posing the issue than in the life and writings of José Martí. Evoking the radical spirit of Latin American independence from Spain, and with an eye of foreboding cast toward the North, Martí drew the deepest lesson from the "history of America, from the Incas to the present": "el libro importado ha sido vencido en América por el hombre natural. Los hombres naturales han vencido a los letrados artificiales. El mestizo autóctono ha vencido al criollo exótico. No hay batalla entre la civilización y la barbarie, sino entre la falsa erudición y la naturaleza."[10] Time and again in his famous, programmatic essay, "Nuestra América" (1891), Martí refers to the book and the printed word as crucial factors in the imposition of foreign culture on the "natural," native population. "Ni el libro europeo ni el libro yankee," he says, "daban la clave del enigma hispanoamericano."[11]

To a mind like Pedreira's, Spain was above all the bearer of civilization and culture to the Americas. Despite the greed and arrogance which motivated them, and the violence and despotism of their colonial rule, the conquerors introduced into a primitive and inarticulate wilderness like Puerto Rico the values of Renaissance and Enlightenment humanism, and the means by which this tiny, isolated province could be drawn into the mainstream of modern world culture. The "culture" of the Island goes on record, therefore, in the surviving chronicles and reports of the soldiers and missionaries and, with the establishment of the first printing press in 1806, the gradual awakening of a native criollo expression. The arrival of an internal print culture is regarded, in fact, as marking the direct stimulus to the "birth" of genuine cultural life, and its lateness in reaching the Island -- the first press came to Mexico in 1539, to Lima in 1584, to Cuba in 1723 and to what is now the United States in 1638 -- as the central reason for the retardation of a specifically Puerto Rican culture. "Todo nos llegó marmado y retrasado; la imprenta, los periódicos, el comercio de libros, las bibliotecas, las instituciones de enseñanza superior, la apetencia por la lectura, la prosa con fines estéticos, en fin, la literatura con todos sus elementos condicionantes son obra exclusivamente de nuestro siglo XIX." (54) Even more clearly and specificaaly than in Insularismo, Pedreira betrays his one-sided view of the role of the colonial press in his otherwise valuable study El periodismo en Puerto Rico.[12]

This unqualified tribute to the progressive, path-breaking influence of a literary print culture by no means began or ended with Pedreira, but characterizes, in one variety or another, the most authoritative recent histories of Puerto Rican literature, such as those of Francisco Manrique Cabrera and José Luis González.[13] On a broader scale, the interpretation of the uniformly progressive influence of literate expression underlies even the most "contemporary," Marxist-influenced histories of printing, such as Lucien Febvre's L' Apparition du livre, published in English in 1976 by New Left Books as The Coming of the Book. Febvre's description of the introduction of the press into the "New World" illustrates clearly how harmoniously this up-to-date cultural history can correspond to the most Eurocentric, colonialist understanding. For Febvre, the printing press complemented harmoniously the simultaneous process of European expansionism, two "great discoveries," in his words, which "rapidly enlarged the horizons of the world known to Western man... The epoch which begins with these discoveries has yet to come to an end, and throughout it Western civilization has acted to transform the rest of the world." "In the conquest of the Americas," he continues,"printing from the beginning had an important influence. We wonder what motive lay behind the assaults by the Conquistadors; was it greed for gold, a taste for adventure? These had their part to play. But their vision of the Indies had been

fed by countless stories of chivalry printed on Spanish presses during the late 15th and early 16th centuries; in these, far off lands were described populated by happy peoples blessed with fabulous riches." [14]

A very different conception of the meaning of these historical events is called to mind by José Martí, for whom the contradiction between the barbarous inhumanity of the conquest and slave trade and the humanistic claims which accompanied the arrival of print assumed a more basic, anthropological urgency. In a direct extension of Martí's thinking, which serves to dramatize clearly the contrast between his approach and that of Pedreira, Febvre and so many other cultural historians, Jean Franco has set the role of European literate and print culture into the appropriate context of colonialist control and cultural imposition. Her analysis represents a landmark in any attempt to move toward a more dynamic, revolutionary vision of the development of Latin American culture, and particularly its indigenous components and struggles. Summarizing the economic conditions prevalent throughout the colonial period, she observes that "the dichotomy between civilization and barbarism was clearly expressed in the difference between enclave and rural cultures." While the enclave culture of the colonial powers "was highly controlled through censorship, the Inquisition, and the monopolization of the printing presses..., the secret weapon of the Indian group was oral tradition in the native language. Indeed the

most significant feature of colonial culture is this differentiation within the production process itself, between an oral culture dependent on a community and written culture, which was overwhelmingly associated with domination. In order to understand the colonial period at all, therefore, it is necessary to study oral narrative and poetry not simply as folklore (a nineteenth century invention) but as an integral part of the living culture which, as in medieval Europe, provided an outlet for the unofficial activities and responses of the indigenous peoples."[15]

This change in modes of cultural communication, rooted as it is in the production process of the society, has a direct bearing on the relative quality of artistic experience, and on the very definition of culture. Jean Franco's rejection of a unilinear conception of cultural "progress" is of key interest and, as she mentions, carries ample relevance to interpretations of contemporary cultural colonialism.

> It is this direct relationship between the oral performer and the community which makes the persistent survival of oral narrative and poetry a matter of more than antiquarian interest. For at the very time when in Europe this direct current was being replaced by published books, when poetry was gradually becoming something to be "overheard" rather than heard (to use J.S. Mills' distinction), in Spanish America it was the slave barracks and the urban barrio as well as the Indian comunidad which produced exciting new variants of language and form. The presence which oral performance implies thus comes to seem, not a stage which writing happily superseded but a different and less individualistic form of art, and one which can teach us much at the present time when the privileged position so long accorded to print culture has been threatened by mass media. To recognize the co-existence and the dialectics of oral performance and print culture also helps us to detect the weakness of certain modern critics whose exclusive concern with print needs correction.[16]

What Martí meant by his poetic opposition between "nature" and erudition, between "los hombres naturales" and "los letrados artificiales," is that Spain brought to the Americas not "civilization" in general, but a certain form of cultural experience which corresponded in many ways to its highly uncivilized and anti-humanist presence in colonial America from the outset. From this vantage point, the introduction by the Spaniards of print culture, that is, an artistic life which depends for its generation and promulgation on the existence of writing and printing, constituted a spearhead in the imposition of the cultural alienation of advancing European capitalism. The economic laws of commodity production -- the supercession of use-value by exchange, the separation of the producer from the object and activity of his labor, and the general intensification of the divisions of labor, in short, the governing prevalence of private property -- all of which were brought to the Americas by the Europeans, have as their cultural correlatives the breakdown in communal spontaneity, the relegation of oral transmission and the instrumentalization of social experience. The evidence of this "alienation" of artistic life within 16th-century Europe, as it stems from economic and political reality and projects into subsequent cultural developments down to the 20th century, has been presented persuasively by Arnold Hauser, especially in his important book on Mannerism: The Crisis of the Renaissance and the Origin of Modern Art.[17] And yet it seems that the magnitude of this change, and its deeper anthropological

implications, stand out in sharpest relief only when viewed in the light of the cultural collisions ensuing from the process of colonial expansion.

There are dangers, of course, in considering the arrival of print in Latin America as a strictly repressive tool, as though the printing press were, in itself, an instrument of capitalist exploitation, and in imputing to the indigenous cultures an idyllic communist harmony. For, as Marx commented repeatedly, "capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons, established by the instrumentality of things," and elaborated by way of emphasis, "A negro is a negro. In certain circumstances he becomes a slave. A mule is a machine for spinning cotton. Only under certain circumstances does it become capital. Outside these circumstances, it is no more capital than gold is intrinsically money, or sugar is the price of sugar."[18] And in response to the reactionary idealization of primitive, provincial societies, Marx extolled, in the famous passages of the Manifesto, the great civilizing, globally liberating strides taken by all mankind with the advent of bourgeois society. "The bourgeoisie," Marx said, and it is obvious that the proliferation of the printing press loomed large in his mind, "by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization."[19]

The fact is, though, that in the sphere of intellectual and cultural production, the "circumstances" surrounding the introduction of the Spanish-owned and controlled press into Latin America were those of commodity production and the reproduction of early capitalist relations. With the same confidence as is evident in Pedreira's attribution of a germinal, formative impact of the printed word on the development of national consciousness in Puerto Rico, it may be argued that it was only in the deliberately subversive use of the press, and in the documented evasion and exposure of its official purpose in the colony, that the real differentiation of a national culture and politics came into being. This perspective on the meaning of the printing press is, in fact, particularly relevant in the case of Puerto Rico. According to the most reliable accounts, the first press was actually brought to the Island by an adventurer and refugee from the French, Spanish and United States governments. The governor at the time, Toribio Montes, fearful of its political potential, immediately bought it up and put it to use for the publication of an official government gazette. For the first years, it seems, the only publication aside from this Gaceta del Gobierno was Ripalda's Catecismo, which was used as required reading in the schools. As Alejandro Tapia y Rivera noted in Mis Memorias, "creo que no había en toda la Isla más imprenta que la poca notable del Gobierno, a cargo, como decía la Gaceta, de don Valeriano Sammillán."[20] It is not the mere presence of print communication, therefore, but the response to its pervasively repressive influence and total official

control, which served to generate an anti-colonial, patriotic spirit.

The remarks of Hostos in his important prologue to the second edition (1873) of La peregrinación de Bayoán provide telling evidence of this crucial cultural reality. Commenting on the tight censorship of his novel in Puerto Rico, Hostos observed: "Lejos de evitar la lectura, la prohibición influyó para hacer más buscada y más leída y mejor comprendida la obra perseguida, y a ella debo en gran parte la autoridad de mi palabra en mi pais...."[21] Even Manuel Alonso's El Gíbaro in fact, undisputedly accepted as the birthstone of Puerto Rican national literature, provides an excellent example. The extent to which the book's original appearance in 1849 was conditioned by censorship and rigid monopoly of the press was persuasively narrated as early as Salvador Brau's prologue, "Al que leyere," to the second edition of 1882, and has been faithfully reiterated in subsequent literary and cultural histories. Any account of the impact of these repressive conditions on the most basic thematic concerns and particular formal and linguistic qualities of the work itself, however, is conspicuously absent from the critical literature to date. Lacking such a structural, sociological interpretation, which would seat the book in the circumstances of literary production of its time, El Gíbaro will remain no more than a treasure-chest of bygone "customs" and nostalgiac curiosity, in Pedreira's words a portrait of "la infancia de nuestras tradiciones, amargura, creencias, virtudes y defectos, y

las aristas ya contemarias de nuestro carácter."(58) Beneath the harmless surface, Alonso was responding, slyly and sarcastically, and by use of intriguing artistic devices drawn from popular modes of expression, to the die-hard colonial conditions in mid-19th century Puerto Rico. The dialectical relation of an astute colonial author to the tightly-guarded means of print communication was clearly paramount among these conditions, and played a key role in the forging of a distinctly national literary expression.

As for the interpretation of indigenous peoples, the imputation to their cultures of a non-alienated, integral, communal character need not involve any romantic presumptions or stretches of fantasy, nor tend to discount the generally progressive importance of print and writing. The condition for such an assessment is that the historical position of the Indian peoples be understood not only in moral, racial or cultural terms, but concretely in its fundamental social, economic and political reality. It is with this dialectical conception that José Carlos Mariátegui posed the "problem of the Indian," and it is perhaps to a country like Perú, with its forceful traditions and unbroken presence of Indian resistance as a central component of the movement for national liberation, to which a re-appraisal of Puerto Rican cultural perspectives need turn. With his thumb to the pulse of the Peruvian revolution, Mariátegui explained the organic relation between the indigenous movement in Spanish America and the ideals of socialism, making clear that it is not by virtue of "civilizing" European influences that this connection first suggests itself: "La fe en el resurgimiento indígena no proviene de un proceso de 'occidentalización' material de la tierra quechua. No es la civilización, no es el alfabeto del blanco, lo que levanta el alma del indio. Es el mito, es la idea de la revolución socialista. La esperanza indígena es absolutamente revolucionaria. El mismo mito, la

misma idea, son agentes decisivos del despertar de otros viejos pueblos, de otras viejas razas en colapso: hindúes, chinos, etc. La historia universal tiende hoy como nunca a regirse por el mismo cuadrante. ¿Por qué ha de ser el pueblo incáico, que construyó el más desarrollado y armónico sistema comunista, el único insensible a la emoción mundial? La consanguinidad del movimiento indigenista con las corrientes revolucionarias mundiales es demasiado evidente para que precise documentarla."[22]

Mariátegui does, indeed, document his claims, and provides an analysis of the economics of Spanish colonialism in the Americas which is readily applicable to Puerto Rico and the extermination of the Taino tribes.[23] In fact, it is not even necessary to employ the methods of modern political economy to substantiate the sharp contrast between the economic assumptions of the indigenous societies and those of the European invaders. The early chronicles themselves, amidst their flurries of utopian fantasy and missionary zeal, contain ample observations about the strikingly different social and property relations among the native population. Columbus, for example, in his historic Letter on the Discovery, said of the native islanders of the Antilles that "they are so guileless and so generous with all that they possess, that no one would believe it who has not seen it. Anything they have, if it be asked of them, they never refuse; on the contrary, they offer it, and they show as much love as if they would give their hearts."[24] In his Letter to Piero Sederini (The Four Voyages), Amerigo Vespucci made observations on the economic life of the Indians

he encountered in Brazil: "They engage in no barter; they neither buy nor sell....They are contented with what nature gives them. The wealth which we affect in this our Europe...they hold of no value at all....They are so liberal in giving that it is the exception when they deny." And the cultural, social significance of this unalienated economic reality is pronounced most emphatically, though in rather Arcadian tones, by the great humanist Peter Martyr in his De Orbe Novo from the early 16th century; of the Tainos, he had the following to say: "They go naked, they know neither weights nor measures, nor that source of all misfortunes, money; living in a golden age, without laws, without prevaricating judges, without books, satisfied with their life,and in no way anxious about the future.... It is proved that amongst them the land belongs to everybody just like the sun or the water. They know no difference between meum and teum, that source of all evils. Little suffices to satisfy them....It is indeed a golden age; neither ditches, nor hedges, nor walls enclose their domains; they live in gardens open to all, without laws and without judges; their conduct is naturally equitable, and whoever injures his neighbor is considered a criminal and an outlaw."

In the case of Puerto Rico, of course, the cultural counterpart to colonial economic transformation -- the relegation of oral culture -- must be understood in a broader sense than a historical account of Indian

societies would suggest. Yet the absence of Indians in modern Puerto Rican history and the relatively secondary role of African slave backgrounds -- compared, say, to Cuba or Brazil -- in no way invalidate the substance of a revolutionary indigenist orientation. For, as Jean Franco points out, the"oral tradition in Spanish America is not confined to the Indian community or the black ghetto. Precisely because of the remoteness of many rural areas, Hispanic folk tradition which transmitted down to recent times something of the medieval folk tradition has also constituted a dynamic factor in the culture of the continent. Until recently, for instance, the improvization of witty verses, often as part of a contest between rival males was a feature of popular cultures in countries as diverse as Cuba, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile."[25]

Such a popular form, in Puerto Rican poetry, is the décima, to which a great deal of editorial and critical attention has been accorded in recent folklore study.[26] All evidence indicates clearly that along with the copla and other short narrative forms, the décima enjoyed a long oral tradition among the illiterate rural population in the colony prior to the arrival of printing, and in its local adaptations bears an emblematic significance as the most representative mode of Puerto Rican poetic expression down to the present. A writer like Pedreira, though, can with a characteristic brush of the hand dismiss this entire legacy of peasant-based poetry. In his futile groping after a distinctly

"Puerto Rican" currency for the national poetry, Pedreira writes off "esas décimas jíbaras tan chabacanas y horrorosas que aquí se hacen sin consecuencias para el que las perpetra. Para cultivar el criollismo hay que tener economías; y lanzar al mundo esas paparruchas al son del tiple y la bordonúa es como dar un cheque sin fondos: claro es que, por falso, no puede circular."(71) It is hardly surprising that with such a disposition toward the popular poetic idiom Pedreira's quest for authentic literary inspiration ends in frustration; while giving his blessing to any and all technical innovation, he can still ask, "A la técnica normativa europea ¿qué rasgo de originalidad criolla le hemos impreso?" His sense of expressive sources is so rarified that, making no mention of the reliance of Luis Lloréns Torres on precisely the décima form nor of Luis Palés Matos' important experiments with Afro-Antillean rhythmic possibilities, he is left with an abstract call for "encyclopedic" knowledge like that of Unamuno and for "un arte criollo de forma superior a la de nuestro Manuel Alonso." "Nuestra literatura," he concludes remorsefully, "no ha recogido aún en forma expresiva la interesante vida indígena, ni el ademán aclaratorio de los conquistadores, ni la savia de nuestra formación, ni la raíz amarga de nuestros principios, ni siquiera el vaivén inquietante de estos días. El ovario de nuestra civilidad aún no ha cristalizado en tema."(75)

Another example of Pedreira's disdain for the popular, indigenous roots of Puerto Rican culture because of his excessive emphasis on the

Spanish heritage is his view of music. In his chapter "He aquí las raíces, " Pedreira speaks of the danza, "de condición femenina, blanda y romántica," as the exclusive pillar of the national music. Though denying it the sublime quality of "pure" world art, he considers the danza to be the "tabla de salvación isleña" and, as exemplified in the national anthem, "La Borinqueña," "una hija legítima de nuestra cultura." (198-199) In this case, a forceful and pointed corrective may be found even within Pedreira's immediate intellectual environment: the other major ensayista of the 1930s, Tomás Blanco, responds directly to this alienated, patrimonial cultural ideal, juxtaposing to it the "natural," popular form of the plena with its strong strains of African origin. In his excellent "Elogio a 'La Plena'," Blanco says, "otros dicen preferir a la danza por cultura y desdeñan la plena por vulgar; olvidando que la cultura no es patrimonio únicamente de lo pulido y retocado, ni la vulgaridad elemento insuperable de lo popular. Los más se limitan a elogiar la danza sin nombrar, ni para bien ni para mal, la plena, como si no existiera."[27] Blanco points out that it is not the plena but the danza which faces extinction as a living art form, since it is basically a cultural transplant whose regional features are more external and attached than intrinsic to the style: "se le cuidó el follaje y la floración a expensas del tallo y las raíces. Sus cultivadores le estilizaron la forma antes que el genio popular tuviera tiempo de modificar su savia."

It is true that the most glaring distortions of Pedreira's Hispanophile approach have been duly addressed in subsequent interpretations of Puerto Rican cultural and social history. In fact it is in the artistic expression of his own time that the importance of Indian and African contributions to the national culture gained increasing recognition, as is most evident in the critical essays of Tomás Blanco and in the poetry of Luis Palés Matos and Juan Antonio Corretjer. Corretjer's long historical poem "Alabanza en la torre de Ciales" (1950) constitutes the most forceful revolutionary indigenist perspective in all of Puerto Rican literature. Not that all influence of Pedreira's anti-indigenous orientation has been overcome, as is evident in the standard histories of the literature and of the music, and even in the widely-read "independentista" history, Puerto Rico: Una interpretación histórico-social (1969) by Manuel Maldonado-Denis, which virtually omits any mention of pre-Columbian Island conditions. But by now references to the Taino and slave backgrounds and to the "popular" culture of the peasantry are more accepted commonplaces than original insights in the description of "authentic" cultural history.

The question is whether this vindication of the "primitive" and the "popular" has yet transcended the symbolic, spiritual and moral level, and penetrated to the radical vision of Martí and the application of historical -- that is, economic and political -- tools of analysis. For it is only when the conquest and the introduction of slavery are

understood as the violent disruption of primitive communal economic formations and their replacement by commodity production, the incorporation of pre-capitalist societies into the global process of early capital accumulation, that primitive and popular "elements" emerge as the real basis of the national culture. Corresponding to this enforced economic upheaval, and the brutal political despotism aimed at assuring its unhampered development, came not only the imposition of a foreign culture, but the supercession of an entire universe of cultural assumptions by another. This "new" cultural domain, with all its claims to humanism and civilization and its evidence of technological progress in literacy and the printing press, had as its most telling effect, precisely because of the economic "circumstances" to which it was inextricably tied, the breaking apart of the spontaneous, organic relation between man and nature, and between individual and community, which had characterized the primitive, oral cultures it replaced.

The real restitution of the "primitive" in Puerto Rican cultural history -- whether it be the Taino or the African legacy -- can come not through the mystified distortions of romantic yearning, nor by detecting "symbols of resistance" in the recorded feats of Indian and slave rebellion. The inheritance of this legacy falls to modern "popular" culture, with its most direct lines of continuity to the cultural experience of the popular classes: the peasantry and the proletariat. For it is the working classes who stand in fullest opposition, not only to Spanish and North

American cultures as imposed foreign cultures but, like the Indians and slaves, to the entire system of bourgeois cultural alienation. Thus, the tradition of indigenous, slave and working class cultural life, though rooted in the productive majority of the society, is not oriented toward a "class culture" in the narrow sense. Rather, this continuum, along with the many strains of internal resistance within the dominant colonial and "criollo" cultures, contains the anticipation of a culture of human freedom from reified social experience in general.[28]

This more global perspective on cultural liberation is indicated in the terms of radical psychological thinking by Father Walter Ong in his book The Presence of the Word: "In an oral culture verbalised learning takes place quite normally in an atmosphere of celebration or play. As events, words are more celebrations and less tools than in literate cultures. Only with the invention of writing and the isolation of the individual from the tribe will verbal learning and understanding itself become 'work' as distinct from play, and the pleasure principle be downgraded as a principle of verbalised cultural continuity."[29] Yet such a perspective, as cogent as it may be in breaking out of the restrictive, hierarchical framework of a thinker like Pedreira, assumes analytical validity only when it is interconnected, in turn, with an understanding of the development of social production. To avoid still another level of mystification, the liberating, non-instrumental dimension of "primitive" cultural experience must be viewed as interlaced with the

revolutionary advances of modern science and technology. That is, the science of historical interpretation, with its recognition of dialectical interaction and the ultimately conditioning force of economic and political reality, is the only method suitable to the task of posing the relation between culture and civilization, and of tracing the formation of Puerto Rican nationality, in accordance with the modern state of human knowledge.

From Hispanism to Racism

How far Pedreira is from scientific thinking about man and society is clear in the very structure of Insularismo. After some introductory reflections, the substance of the book begins with the section entitled "Biología, Geografía, Alma." What comes first, not only sequentially but conceptually as well, are the biological -- that is, racial -- and geographical conditions of the people, which go to determine, then, the state of their "soul." The "fusion" of different races accounts for their "confusion," and their habitation on a diminutive, tropical "insular" terrain for the sense of inferiority and isolation which characterize the national psyche: "El clima nos derrite la voluntad y causa en nuestra psicología rápidos deterioros. El calor nos madura antes de tiempo y antes de tiempo también nos descompone."(38) This crude racial and geographical determinism, the inheritance of such dated 19th-century European writers as Taine and Gobineau, have enjoyed wide currency among the Latin American intellectual elite, most notably the Argentine Carlos Octavio Bunge in his Nuestra América (1903) and Alcides Aguedas in the book about his native Bolivia, Pueblo enfermo (1908).[30] As has been shown, these early 20th-century theories harken back, in turn, to that infamous tract by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento written late in his life, Conflicto y armonías de las razas en América (1883).[31] Pedreira, then, is not at all alone

in his racial theorizing, as is most evident in a comparison of his ideas with those of the most influential of all the Latin American essays, José Enrique Rodó's Ariel (1900) and José Vasconcelos' La raza cósmica (1925).

Like most of these books, Insularismo has as its underlying premises not only the determining power of race, but the inherent inferiority of the indigenous and African "races" to the Europeans, and the Spaniards in particular. Not only does he eliminate the Indians as a constitutive force in subsequent national formation, but Pedreira explicitly attributes their rapid extinction to biological weaknesses and deficiencies. Even more shocking is his treatment of the African slaves -- without a note of reservation, Pedreira speaks of the Blacks as an "inferior race," capable of hard work but lacking in "la inteligencia del blanco." What is most surprising, and contradictory, in this disgraceful example of pseudoscientific prejudice is that while Pedreira considers the Spaniards as the founders and forgers of Puerto Rican character, it is the admixture of African "blood" which is held responsible for the most characteristic traits of the national personality:

> La firmeza y la voluntad del europeo retienen a su lado la duda y el resentimiento del africano. Y en los momentos más graves nuestras decisiones vacilan en un ir y venir sin reposo buscando su acomodo. Nuestras rebeldías son momentáneas; nuestra docilidad permanente. En instantes de trascendencia histórica en que afloran en nuestros gestos los ritmos marciales de la sangre europea somos capaces de las más altas empresas y de los más esforzados heróismos. Pero cuando el gesto viene empapado de oleadas de sangre africana quedamos indecisos, como embobados ante las cuentas de colores o amedrentados ante la visión cinemática de brujas y fantasmas.(29)

This kind of muddled rhetoric and allegorical mystification shows that the basic "confusion" is that of the author, and not of the people he is attempting to describe.

Nor was Pedreira the first Puerto Rican writer to conjure up these "secret biological stimuli" from the subsoil of a presumed national character, and his forebears were, in many respects, among the most enlightened and progressive thinkers of their time. Salvador Brau, for one, the revered historian and dramatist whose Puerto Rico y su historia (1894), Historia de Puerto Rico (1904) and La colonización de Puerto Rico (1930) continue to furnish key sources of modern historical study, had the following to say in his description of the Puerto Rican peasantry, Las clases jornaleras (1882):

> Ahí teneis las primordiales fuentes de nuestro carácter: del indio le quedó la indolencia, la taciturnidad, el desinterés y los hospitalarios sentimientos; el africano le trajo su resistencia, su vigorosa sensualidad, la superstición y el fatalismo; el español le inoculó su gravedad caballeresca, su altivez característica, sus gustos festivos, su austera devoción, la constancia en la adversidad y el amor a la patria y a la independencia.

It is worth noting that in his Historia de la literatura puertorriqueña (1971), Francisco Manrique Cabrera cites just this passage from Brau, commenting only that it has to do with "aquellos rasgos que en todos los puertorriqueños son proverbiales."[32] This type of racial attribution also appears at points in the writings of the foremost Puerto Rican novelist and democratic journalist, Manuel Zeno Gandía. In his widely-read

La charca (1894), the influence of the naturalist theories of Zola and of Herbert Spencer's Social Darwinism leads Zeno Gandía to include among the ruminations of his main character, the landowner Juan del Salto, recurrent thoughts on the racial composition of his campesinos: "Se daba cuenta exacta de la situación que aquellas clases ocupaban en la colonia. Las veía descender por línea recta de mezclas étnicas cuyo producto nacía contaminado de morbosa debilidad, de una debilidad invencible, de una debilidad que, apoderándose de la especie, le había dejado exangue las arterias, sin fluido nervioso el cerebro, sin vigor el brazo, arrojándola como masa orgánica imposible para la plasmación de la vida, en el plano inclinado a la miseria, de la desmoralización y de la muerte."[33] In this case, of course, racialist thinking appears in a muted, conditional context, and can be attributed only indirectly to Zeno Gandía himself -- the speaker is a fictional character, with an abruptly vacillating personality and only partially identifiable as a spokesman for the author. Further, his central role is counteracted by the figure of Silvina, the young peasant woman whose finely drawn, complex personality contrasts sharply, and as a kind of subliminal representation of the social struggle, with the disjointed clinical observations of the hacendado.

No such narrative perspective and fictional contextuality surround Pedreira's racial notions, however, nor are they uttered, like

those of Salvador Brau, by way of more or less passing remarks within a larger historical panorama. Despite its metaphorical eloquence, Insularismo is a book of discursive argument, of which racial determinism figures as the conceptual pillar and structural pivot, and the accompanying geographical attribution as the leading, defining metaphor. Time and again throughout, conclusions about the Puerto Rican character are traced to "biological heredity" and to climatic, topographic or demographic milieu with a definitiveness and directness of attribution not present in those more circumspect interpretations of national identity.

An even more important difference between the racial thinking of writers like Salvador Brau and Zeno Gandía and that of Pedreira is the distinction between the historical periods in which they were articulated. By the time of Insularismo, theories of racial "values" and "qualities" like Pedreira's were already largely discredited in circles of modern science -- which is not to say, of course, that they have failed to reappear, in more "sophisticated" form and with continuing appeals to scientific authority, down to the present day. Pedreira might have been warned, had he been alert to the ideological currents supporting Hitler's ascent to power during the very years in which he was writing, that racialist typologies had become the tools

of the most reactionary and imperialist thinkers of his time. What is perhaps even more ironic -- and pertinent to the case of Puerto Rican history -- is that it was this very ideology which was appealed to in justifying the United States occupation of the Caribbean. In 1900, Senator A. J. Beveridge of Florida pronounced the following words to Congress in arguing for the expedient take-over of Puerto Rico: "God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns... He has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savage and servile peoples."[34]

Now it would be wrong-headed and far-fetched to suggest any direct alignment between Pedreira's search for determining racial features of Puerto Rican culture and this imperialist rhetoric, based as it is in the decidedly anti-"Latin" Aryanism of H.S. Chamberlain and backed up as it is by the machinery of expansionist power. The political and economic conditions which gave rise to these versions of racial differentiation must be distinguished qualitatively, as must the intentions of their authors. But considered as ideology, as an explanation of human relations, Pedreira's account of Puerto Rican history as the gradual triumph of Spanish and European "blood" over the intrinsically retarding African and Indian influences no doubt bears closer resemblance to

tracts like Chamberlain's The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century (1897) than to the kind of enlightened humanistic vision that guided the consistently anti-imperialist position of José Martí. Writing in 1891, Martí proclaimed, "No hay odios de razas, porque no hay razas. Los pensadores canijos, los pensadores de lámpara, enhebran y recalientan las razas de librería, que el viajero justo y el observador cordial buscan en vano en la justicia de la Naturaleza, donde resalta, en el amor victorioso y el apetito turbulento, la identidad universal del hombre. El alma emana, igual y eterna, de los cuerpos diversos en forma y en color. Peca contra la Humanidad el que fomente y propague la oposición y el odio de las razas."[35]

This anti-racialist, scientific humanism of Martí, which has found a remarkably faithful echo in our times in the statements on race submitted to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), prevailed, in fact, in Pedreira's own intellectual environment. While at Columbia University in the 1920's, he had no need to go far afield to come into contact with the enormous influence of Franz Boas in physical and cultural anthropology. And in Puerto Rico, Pedreira's closest contemporary and, according to the commonplaces of intellectual history, most kindred spirit, Tomás Blanco, held markedly different opinions about the issue of race. In his defence of the plena, Blanco presents a realistic and objective description of the ethnic

make-up of the Puerto Rican people, emphasizing that it is to be considered neither especially honorable nor dishonorable to be mestizo, white, black, yellow or red. His rejection of racial attribution goes even further than Martí's, and contains a reference to uneven economic and social development which brings it close, in fact, to the concerns of a Marxist frame of analysis; "mantener la inferioridad esencial de ciertas razas," Blanco states, "es un mero pretexto imperialista, digno sólo de nazis absurdos o de pintorescos coroneles honorarios de la Sudlandia estadounidense, que a nosotros no nos interesa secundar. La reivindicación de los valores inherentes a las diversas culturas primitivas es un hecho significativo de nuestro tiempo y un índice de la seriedad de los pensadores que de estas cosas se ocupan. Hoy sólo puede admitirse que hay pueblos en mayor o menor estado de desarrollo; pero de ningún modo adjudicar a la raza negra, a la amarilla o a la roja, como cualidad intrínsica e inseparable, la barbarie, el salvajismo o la inferioridad."[36]

Somehow, these contemporary contributions to a scientific understanding of human diversity escaped Pedreira's attention, and he was left with the typological speculations most characteristic of colonialist anthropology. Yet his closest intellectual company is no more Chamberlain and the forebears of National Socialism than it is Martí, Tomás Blanco or his revered Hostos, whose broad-minded article in defense of the

indigenous basis of Peruvian national identity, "El Cholo" (1870), goes conspicuously without mention in Pedreira's critical biography.[37] Rather, Insularismo is most accurately situated in relation to the writings to which Pedreira explicitly refers: Rodo's Ariel, Ortega y Gasset's La rebelión de las masas and Spengler's Der Untergang des Abendlandes (The Decline of the West). For despite the evident trappings of Eurocentric racialist thinking, and their central function in Pedreira's argument, the most pressing spiritual motivation of the book is directed not against the "backwardness" of non-European peoples, but against the political and social developments of modern Western civilization, meaning, most obviously, the United States. The ambiguities of this position as it appears in Insularismo can be unravelled in their full intricacy only if account is taken of the direct and total domination of Puerto Rico by North American imperialism and of the impact of this historical fact on all aspects of the colonial society. But precisely because of the inward, self-reflective, ahistorical and above all eclectic quality of Pedreira's speculations, the intellectual currents at work in the book -- the impact of minds on his mind -- assume a special, almost overwhelming importance, and help greatly in explaining the finer shadings of his ideology.

"Arielismo" and the Recourse to Latinity

More clearly perhaps than any other Puerto Rican writing, Insularismo belongs to the "Arielist" movement that swept through the Spanish-speaking intellectual world through the first three decades of the 20th century. All of the ideological fashions inaugurated by José Enrique Rodó with the publication of his Ariel in 1900 -- elitism, individualism, rhetorical appeal to "youth" and national rejuvenation, the counterposing of Latin aristocratic grace to Anglo-Saxon utilitarianism and democracy -- find their faithful echo in Pedreira's essays. The tone of the entire book is set by the spirit of Ariel, a debt which Pedreira acknowledges when, anticipating opposition to his pessimistic observations, he cites Rodó in the opening pages of Insularismo: "hay pesimismos que tienen la significación de un optimismo paradójico. Muy lejos de suponer la renuncia y la condenación de la existencia, ellos propagan, con su descontento de lo actual, la necesidad de renovarla." (11-12) And the entire conclusion of Insularismo, entitled "La luz de la esperanza," especially the closing chapter, "Juventud, divino tesoro" (a line from Darío), bears the unmistakable imprint of the words of Rodó's mouthpiece, Próspero: "La juventud, que así significa en el alma de los individuos y la de las generaciones, luz, amor, energía, existe y lo significa también en el proceso evolutivo

de las sociedades. De los pueblos que sienten y consideran la vida como vosotros, serán siempre la fecundidad, la fuerza, el dominio del porvenir."[38]

Such defining influence of Arielist thinking on a writer like Pedreira is no surprise, since Rodó's style and orientation spread like wildfire among Spanish and Latin American intellectuals. Prominent Spanish philosophers like Rafael Altamira, Leopoldo Alas, Miguel de Unamuno and Juan Valera all received complimentary copies of Ariel in 1900 and responded with great admiration. Among Latin American intellectuals, from Cuba, Perú, México, Argentina and Chile, the reception was even more profound, and sparked an entire movement. As the Peruvian Luis Alberto Sánchez stated in his survey, Balance y liquidación del Novecientos, "los arielistas constituyen la más importante promoción ideológica de Nuestra América, antes de 1930."[39]

The most pronounced relevance of Rodó's manifesto to Pedreira's interpretation of Puerto Rican culture is located at the level of mythical polarity and its application to historical events. As has been pointed out, Ariel refers only indirectly to its original source, Shakespeare's The Tempest, the literary motif of Prospero, Ariel and Caliban having been transmitted to Rodó in the version of Ernest Renan's adaptation of 1878, Caliban, suite de la Tempete. In this philosophical drama, the myth is given a decidedly reactionary interpretation, since Renan was

responding with horror to the recent events of the Paris Commune: Caliban represents the vulgar masses, who conquer power from the aristocratic intellectual, Prospero, and send Ariel, the embodiment of spiritual value, into exile from human life. Rodó's indebtedness to Renan is acknowledged throughout his writings, and his ferociously anti-democratic ideas inform the elitist tenor of Ariel.[40]

Yet Renan's position is also overtly colonialist and racialist in its basic motivation, whereas Rodó was a colonial intellectual writing in opposition to modern imperialism. Between the time of Renan's influence on the Latin American "positivists" and the appearance of Ariel came the Spanish-American War and the ominous presence of North American expansionism. Rodó is known to have firmly supported the Cuban independence struggle, and his programmatic book must be understood, and appreciated, as a powerful voice of resistance to the United States. It has even been argued, with some justice, that "Rodó, in Ariel, ... is closer to Martí than Darío."[41] In any case, Rodó's immediate inspiration in taking up his leading theme was neither Shakespeare nor Renan, but the French Argentine writer Paul Groussac, who in a Buenos Aires speech on May 2, 1898 made the statement: "desde la Secesión y la brutal invasión del Oeste, se ha desprendido libremente el espíritu yankee del cuerpo informe y 'calibanesco', y el viejo mundo ha contemplado con inquietud y terror a la novísima civilización que pretende suplantar a la nuestra declarada caduca."[42]

It is this curious application of the Caliban symbol to the supposedly "advanced," modern civilization of the United States and the Anglo-Saxon "North," and the virtual inversion of the myth in its original conception, which characterizes Rodó's interpretation. For although he begins by speaking of Ariel as "el imperio de la razón y el sentimiento sobre los bajos estímulos de la irracionalidad" and of Calíban as a "símbolo de sensualidad y de torpeza," the whole of Rodó's argument is directed against the very "rationalistic" and not very "sensual" values attached to North American life; "la concepción utilitaria, como idea del destino humano, y la igualdad en lo mediocre, como norma de la proporción social."[43] Caliban for Rodó is not the vulgar proletarian masses and inferior non-European races, as he was for Renan, but the spiritual void of materialism and levelling mediocrity represented by Yankee culture. The other pole of this typology, Ariel, stands for Christian spirituality, Platonic aristocracy and inspired creativity as characterized by the "Latin" south of the Americas.

It is this version of the Ariel-Caliban myth which underlies Pedreira's stance toward the influence of North American culture in Puerto Rico. Whenever he comes to speak of the United States, the familiar image of Rodó's Caliban makes its appearance; the entire chapter "Intermezzo: Una nave al garete," in fact, with its mournful phrases about "el afán económico y utilitario," "la vulgaridad del presente" and

"la plebeya depauperación intelectual," reads like a paraphrase of Ariel. In general, the intellectual current introduced by Rodó and taken up by Pedreira may be regarded as the posing of the "Latin" ideals inherited from the former "mother country" against the contaminating influence of the real and present threat, Nordic, Anglo-Saxon culture. This recourse to Latinity, with its glorification of Ariel-like spirituality and revulsion toward the revised Caliban-image of Northern mediocrity, lies at the heart of intellectual and cultural opposition to United States imperialism throughout Latin America, and situates Pedreira's stance within a broadly progressive context.

But, as the case of Pedreira shows, Rodó's influence was riddled with ambiguities from the outset, and in many ways represents the equivocation and vacillation of the colonial intelligentsia in the face of modern imperialist domination. Thus, while the Cuban "Arielist" Julio Antonio Mella interpreted Rodó as having regarded the intellectual as "el trabajador del pensamiento" and became one of the founders of the Cuban Communist Party in 1925, Francisco García Calderón of Perú could equally cite Rodó in calling, in French, for the increased immigration of Europeans to civilize the backward Indian masses; similarly, Rodó's fellow Uruguayan Alberto Nin Frías could make the claim, in 1907, that "Of all the nations of America, the ones that have the greatest intrinsic value are Argentina and Uruguay: this is so because they have almost

completely gotten rid of the autochthonous race."[44] The clearest example of this two-sided impact of "Arielism" in the work of a single Latin American intellectual is José Vasconcelos: while incorporating Indian and mestizo components into his vision of the Latin American "raza cósmica," his pedagogical and ideological ideals as Mexican Secretary of Education were no less elitist, idealistic and, in fact, Hispanophile and European than those of other "Latinists."

In some important respects, José Vasconcelos may be viewed as the counterpart to Pedreira in Mexican intellectual life and, because of his international renown, in the Latin American "Arielist" movement generally. His heralding of the "fusion of races," including the Indians, as a new stage of humanity contrasts sharply, of course, with Pedreira's contention that racial fusion among Puerto Ricans is responsible for their "con-fusion" as a people. But despite this difference, and Vasconcelos' public role in Mexican politics, both thinkers stand in a similar position as the fathers of modern national self-definition, and have exercised a defining impact on institutionalized cultural interpretation in their respective countries. What is more important, both Pedreira and Vasconcelos attempted to apply the tenets of Rodó's Ariel-Caliban mythology in the years of entrenched imperialist presence in Latin America, and served to frame the resistance to North America in primarily cultural, spiritual terms. How close their conceptual and methodological approaches are can be seen in comparing Insularismo with

Vasconcelos' Indología (1927), a work which begins, significantly, with a lengthy account of his visit to Puerto Rico hosted by Pedreira's main academic patron, the University Chancellor Thomas E. Brenner. It seems more than possible that the very topics and structure of Insularismo were suggested by the contents of Vasconcelos' book, which begins with chapters entitled "el asunto," "la tierra," and "el hombre" and leads up to "el conflicto" and "el ideal." Whatever may be said of these more direct influences, the spiritual kinship and intellectual parallels are undeniable. The same social and cultural perspective inherited by both thinkers from Rodó's Ariel -- and the same ultimate political equivocation -- characterize their interpretation of Latin American reality, such that the guiding words of La raza cósmica (1925) could well serve as a motto to Insularismo: "Solamente la parte ibérica del continente," Vasconcelos wrote, "dispone de los factores espirituales, la raza y el territorio que son necesarios para la gran empresa de iniciar la era universal de la humanidad."[45]

The corrective to this "Arielist" conception involves nothing less than a return to the original framing of the myth and an insistence that "Nuestro símbolo no es pues Ariel, como pensó Rodó, sino Calibán." The Cuban revolutionary writer Roberto Fernández Retamar has taken up this intellectual and political challenge, reverting the figure of Caliban to its original etymological identification with "Canibal" and "caribe"

and proclaiming, in unison with Simón Bolívar, José Martí and the entire Latin American revolutionary tradition, "¿qué es nuestra historia, qué es nuestra cultura, sino la historia, sino la cultura de Calibán?"[46] Caliban is no longer the symbol of northern, Anglo-Saxon utilitarianism and materialism, but stands for the most severe victims and absolute antagonists of United States imperialist "rationality," the masses of oppressed Latin American Indians, slaves and peasants. And as for the "Ariels," Fernández Retamar attributes to them the role of the "traditional" intellectual, in Antonio Gramsci's sense, who stand in a tenuous, vacillating position between defense of the "old" society, that is, service to "Prospero," and alliance with the movement of Caliban for human liberation. It is a thinker like Pedreira, who holds up his Latinized ideal to the reality of imperialist saturation and with all his "cultural resistance" could advocate the adoption of English as the official language of Puerto Rico, who is most aptly represented by "Ariel," and not the Puerto Rican people or Latin American society.

"Si Ortega y Gasset fuera puertorriqueño.."

The intellectual tenor of Rodó and "Arielismo" probably came to Pedreira, and to Puerto Rico, by way of Spain, and in close association with the ideas of Ortega y Gasset. In any event, the prevailing trends of Latin American cultural theory form one part -- and in fact the most progressive aspect -- of the larger ideological atmosphere which surrounds Insularismo. By the time of Pedreira's own educational development in the 1920s, in fact, it was more Ortega y Gasset and Spengler than Rodó who set the tenor of contemporary intellectual fashion. The bearing of their writings on Pedreira -- and he quotes them repeatedly -- helps define even more precisely than the legacy of "arielismo" the political position assumed in Insularismo.

The enormous influence of Ortega y Gasset in Latin America, particularly in Argentina which he visited in 1916 and 1929, and among the Mexican philosophers Samuel Ramos and Leopoldo Zea, has been well summarized.[47] His appraisal of the condition of modern Spain, in fact, served as a model for many of the "ensayistas," including Pedreira, in developing critical interpretations of their own societies. His international stature and weighty philosophical concerns widened the horizons of their analysis and allowed them, as Zea said, to

"feel justified as a participant in culture in a more general sense."[48] Not only did he help in the founding of the influential Argentine magazine Sur, but his opus includes two important essays about Latin America, "Hegel y América" (1928(and "La pampa...promesas" (1929). As recently as 1956 Leopoldo Zea entitled an article "Ortega el americano."

The references to Ortega y Gasset in Insularismo, however, do not take up his "existentialist," philosophical system, nor even his relevant reflections on the national theme of "España invertebrada." Ortega y Gasset for Pedreira was the author of La rebelión de las masas (1930), and his singular intellectual contribution was his disdain for mass democracy and the social impact of modern scientific progress. In the beginning of Insularismo, Pedreira utilizes Ortega y Gasset to separate his search for the "essence" of cultural identity from any sense of historical progress: "las gentes frívolas," in the Spanish philosopher's words, "piensan que el progreso humano consiste en un aumento cuantitavo de las cosas y de las ideas. No, no, el progreso verdadero es la creciente intensidad con que percibimos media docena de misterios cardinales que en la penumbra de la historia laten convulsos como perennes corazones."(13) And the definition of culture throughout Insularismo as "intensidad vital" is little more than a replica of the highly intellectualized vitalism which Ortega y Gasset posed as the only existential salvation from the overly rationalized, scientific society of modern times.

The real indication of the importance of Ortega y Gasset's social philosophy emerges when Pedreira comes to consider the situation of Puerto Rico in the 20th century. In fact, Pedreira goes so far as to identify the argument of Rebelión de las masas with the entire history of Puerto Rico since the turn of the century when he declares, "Si Ortega y Gasset fuera puertorriqueño, hubiese escrito su libro La Rebelión de las masas, veinticinco años atrás." (104) For the main result of the transfer from Spanish to North American rule over the Island is for Pedreira not the difference between traditional colonialism and modern imperialism, but the collective degeneration from a "cultured" to a "civilized" society. The most essential feature of this transformation is the substitution of aristocratic values and the primacy of spiritual quality with mass democracy and the "fallacy" of egalitarianism: "con el cambio de soberanía caímos de bruces sobre la democracia y fatalmente hemos ayudado a fomentar la mediocracia." Pedreira goes on to pronounce this elitist position in terms derived directly from Ortega y Gasset: "el imperio del número, del justo medio, excluye accidentalmente la colaboración extraordinaria de los selectos. Con iguales oportunidades para todos, la plebe se ha sentido satisfecha al ver subir sus valores a costa del descenso de los hombres cultos. La astucia, la habilidad y la osadía hoy son atributos más eficaces que el mérito, la dignidad y los principios. Da pena ver en nuestro

pueblo el retraimiento de hombres superiores que se aislan en la oquedad de sus casas para defender su aristanquía del irrespetuoso predominio de los mediocres." (102-3)

It is true that Pedreira, like Ortega y Gasset, arrives at these anti-democratic conclusions by way of a radical, and seemingly justified, response to the reification and quantification which accompany the development of modern capitalist society, a process which enveloped Puerto Rico with particular intensity upon the passage of the colony from Spanish to North American hands. Neither thinker, however, anchors this increasing alienation and disengagement of cultural values from technological advance in the economic structure of society; each attributes it to the impetuous ascent of the "vulgar" masses and subordination of the chosen few who are by destiny called upon to direct society. And while in the case of Ortega it may be argued that his attack on "mediocrity" was directed, in a tactical sense, against the irresponsibility and corruption of the monarchy -- Rebelión de las masas, be it remembered, was being written at the time when Ortega y Gasset resigned from his prestigious professorial position in protest against the closing down of the University of Madrid in 1929 -- Pedreira places the "blame" for the democratization of society squarely on the North American "liberals" and, by indirection, on the Puerto Rican "people" themselves. The "superior minority" (can one help thinking

of Pedreira himself?) have been forced out of public life into the ivory tower by the advent and political enfranchisement of the incompetent many. As if the "problem" introduced into Puerto Rico by the United States imperialists were democracy!

Both Pedreira and Ortega y Gasset ground their distinction between the elite and "mass man" in class differences, and no interpretation to the contrary stands the test of critical analysis.[49] As much as they may try, in all good faith, to couch their appeals to nobility in terms of abstract qualities, moral values and psychological types, it remains anything but coincidental that the "higher classes generally have a larger share of excellent men than the lower."[50] Any tribute Ortega y Gasset may have paid to the working class -- as when he proclaimed in 1931 that "for sixty years, the most energetic force in universal history has been the magnificient upward movement of the working classes" -- appears as a rather idle gesture in the light of his naive idealistic notions about capitalist relations of production: the "idea of work," he contended, "should make the abyss that exists between workers and those who are not workers disappear, for as the former work with the hoe on the divine earth, the latter will work by means of their capital."[51] Similarly with Pedreira: while he pays passing respects to the "exquisita masa anónima" (36) for its historical role, and even voices sympathy for the Puerto Rican worker who, "desde siempre...come mal,

vive mal, trabaja mucho y gana poco," he goes on to thank the select minority for having paved the nation's path to immortality, and to incorporate this enduring economic misery into the more encompassing framework of his atmospheric determinism: "Temporales, terremotos y epidemias agravan de tarde en tarde el permanente desquilibrio económico, y bajo la exuberancia retórica de un adjetivo, arrastramos, con languidez vegetativa, nuestra existencia agria."(143) It is this polarization of class "moralities," with the leading and defining role attributed to the "superior" minority, which guides Ortega y Gasset, and Pedreira, in their conception of national history and culture. A nation is, for Ortega y Gasset, "organized by a minority of select individuals"; regardless of its particular political or legal structure, "its living and extra-legal institution will always consist in the dynamic influence of a minority acting on a mass."[51] This process of social selection, which Ortega y Gasset elevates to the status of a natural law, provides the fundamental premise of all historical study.

The elitist orientation of Ortega y Gasset and Pedreira has its point of origin in modern cultural theory in Nietzsche's "master and slave morality," another vehement ideological reaction to the European class struggle and, as with Renan, to the implications of the Paris Commune in particular. Ortega y Gasset's application of this Nietzschean

anti-democratic thinking to 20th-century conditions helps illuminate further the inversion of the Caliban myth as in Rodó and the "arielista" movement, that is, the identification of modern democracy as "vulgar" and "primitive." In Ortega y Gasset's view, "el hombre hoy dominante es un primitivo, un Naturmensch emergiendo en medio de un mundo civilizado."[52] "Si ese tipo humano sigue dueño de Europa," he states in another passage, "bastarán treinta años para que nuestro continente retroceda a la barbarie."[53] The ominous "revolt of the masses" is, in an allusion to a phrase of the German politican and industrialist Walter Rathenau, the "vertical invasion of the barbarians." The actual mass-man is, in fact, "un primitivo, que por los bastidores se ha deslizado en el viejo escenario de la civilización."[54] Pedreira adopts this scorn for the "primitive" masses in his comments on the imposition of a supposedly democratic process in Puerto Rico. This equation of the barbarian morality of resentment and modern democracy underlies even his pejorative racial theories, as when he remarks, "el grifo con la poca sangre blanca que abona su derecho aspira y ambiciona y su resentimiento encuentra válvula de escape en la democracia."(27)

The Spengler Vogue: Culture vs. Civilization

Ortega y Gasset's influence had the important and in many ways salutary effect of transmitting the concerns of modern Spanish philosophy to contemporary thinkers of Latin America, including colonially occupied Puerto Rico. His most significant contribution as an intellectual bridge, however, was his introduction of current philosophical issues and vocabulary from the rest of Europe, particularly Germany, into the Spanish-speaking world, both Iberian and American. In his own writings, and above all in his editorial capacity of the Revista de Occidente, the theories of Wilhelm Rickert, Georg Simmel, Hermann Cohen, Martin Heidegger and many other German philosophers were first made accessible to Hispanic intellectuals. In the first year of its publication, 1923, the Revista de Occidente featured translations from that weighty German book which was attracting intellectual attention throughout the Western world, but was as yet relatively unknown among Spanish readers: Oswald Spengler's Der Untergang des Abendlandes (The Decline of the West).

To a large degree, the impact of Ortega y Gasset on a writer like Pedreira was really the impact of Spengler. Not that Ortega y Gasset's works may be considered a simple restatement of Spengler, nor that his theories lacked a particularity and authenticity and a relation to far more sophisticated philosophical minds than that of Spengler. But the

"popular" Ortega y Gasset, those of his ideas which struck a topical chord and found general intellectual currency, stand in closest running discourse with Spengler's and appear in many ways as a commentary to and cultural translation of The Decline of the West. Thus, whatever conclusions may be reached about Pedreira's reading, and application, of Ortega y Gasset are best drawn in the context of his adoption of the more presumptuous ideological framework represented by Spengler. The philosophy of history, concept of culture and political and class attachment of Insularismo all seem inspired by the fashionable dualities of the Spenglerian world-view. Here again, Pedreira was by no means alone among Latin American intellectuals of his time; Spengler was "in the air" in the early 1930s, as is evident even in thinkers far more "modern" and original than Pedreira, such as the Argentine critic Ezequiel Martínez Estrada and the Mexican philospher Samuel Ramos. Martínez Estrada's Radiografía de la pampa and Ramos' El perfil del hombre y de la cultura en México, both bearing strong influences of Spengler in association with existentialist and psychoanalytical theories, appeared in 1933 and 1934 respectively.

Pedreira not only situates Puerto Rican culture as "un gesto americano de la cultura de España" but, utilizing the universalist terms of Spengler, he says of Spain that it is no more than "una actitud en la escuela de la cultura occidental." By "Western culture" Pedreira

is actually referring to a "stage" in the development of the Greco-Latin tradition, the features of which were drawn by Spengler: "Oswald Spengler en su discutida obra La Decadencia del Occidente, divide la primera (la cultura universal) en dos grandes estadios: la cultura antigua de alma apolínea y la occidental de alma fáustica. Serenidad e inquietud la diferencia." (14-15) The culture of Puerto Rico, according to this scheme, constitutes an extension of the "Faustian" culture of passionate striving which, in Spengler's words, "blossomed forth with the birth of the Romanesque style in the tenth century on the Northern plain between the Elbe and the Tagus."[55] The Teutonic cradle and content of this cultural "stage" is strongly emphasized, and the dichotomy itself between classical serenity and modern romantic yearning is rooted in German cultural theory, as in Schiller's distinction between "naive" and "sentimental" poetry. The category of "Apollonian" poise attached to Hellenic culture stems directly from Nietzsche's Birth of Tragedy (1869), though Spengler significantly misrepresents his source by failing to mention that Nietzsche considered the real origins of Greek culture to be not Apollonian rationalism but the "Dionysian" stage of ecstatic rapture with its roots in the ancient Orient.

In any case, Pedreira's receptive reference to Spengler's "macrocosmic" polarities indicates that he traced the lineage of Puerto

Rican culture not only to Catholic Spain but, on a universal plane, to the medieval and modern "Germanic" stages of the Greco-Latin tradition. This identification with the "Faustian Soul" in 1934, the founding years of the Third Reich, swarms with political and ideological implications. The same Occidentalist vision was expressed in Puerto Rico before Insularismo, and in even more memorable language, in the poetry of Luis Lloréns Torres. In his poem to Ponce de Leon, in fact, the conquistador is mythicized not only as Don Juan and Don Quixote, but as the "Faust" of Latin American history.[56] In Pedreira's own time, even the most forthright and articulate demands for Puerto Rican national sovereignity were characteristically framed by an extended, Western universalist version of the Hispanophile ideal. Vicente Geigel Polanco, for example, established in just such terms the fully developed nationhood of Puerto Rico at the inception of North American political control over the Island. By 1898, he wrote in 1936, "Contaba...nuestro pueblo con una población homogénea de un millon de almas, con una definida personalidad histórica; con un idioma común; formada espiritualmente en las enseñanzas éticas del cristianismo católico; con un claro concepto del derecho, derivado de fuentes romanas, y una sólida cultura, entroncada en las más altas tradiciones grecolatinas."[57]

But the most compelling attraction of Spengler's "morphology" of world history was his contrast between "culture" and "civilization."

This conceptual polarity also informs the cultural speculations of Ortega y Gasset -- despite his forceful claim to the contrary -- and is likewise but a schematized popularization of a longstanding current in German philosophy going back to Kant and Hegel. In Spengler, though, the dualism is expounded in its sharpest relief, forms the crux of an organicist theory of history, and gives voice to the widespread cultural despair among European intellectuals in response to World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution. Pedreira, therefore, picks up not only a set of philosophical categories, but an entire theoretical and historical context when he applies Spengler to his explanation of Puerto Rican cultural history.

"Culture" is identified as the vibrant, living expression of the "soul" of a people or an epoch. "Every Culture," according to Spengler, "passes through the age-phases of the individual man. Each has its childhood, youth, manhood and old age."[58] This crass dogma of cultural life-cycles rests on a decidedly mystical concept of culture which,in Spengler's words, "is born in the moment when a great soul awakens out of the proto-spirituality of ever childish humanity, and detaches itself, a form from the formless, a bounded and mortal thing from the boundless and enduring. It blooms on the soil of an exactly definable landscape, to which plant-wise it remains bound. It dies when this soul has actualized the full sum of its possibilities in the shape of peoples,

languages, dogmas, arts, sciences, and reverts into the proto-soul."[59] "Civilization," on the other hand, is identified with the death of culture, "the inevitable destiny of the Culture." "Civilizations are the most external and artificial states of which a species of developed humanity is capable." Speaking of the transition from Greece to Rome, Spengler juxtaposes "soul" and "intellect," "and this antithesis is the differentia between Culture and Civilization." "Again and again," Spengler continues, in a description which Pedreira would certainly have identified with the North American cultural invaders, "there appears this type of strong-minded, completely non-metaphysical man, and in the hands of this type lies the intellectual and material destiny of every 'late' period. Pure civilization, as a historical process, consists in a progressive exhaustion of forms that have become inorganic or dead."[60]

In defining the difference between 19th and 20th-century Puerto Rico, Pedreira speaks of a collective passage "de lo culto a lo civilizado"(97); "hoy somos más civilizados, pero ayer éramos más cultos."(99) The most profound effect of imperialist occupation was, for Pedreira, the rude interruption of the life-span of Puerto Rican culture and its replacement with cosmopolitan progress and civilization. Pedreira draws this perspective directly from Spengler, who in another rhetorical formulation of his main theme portrays the process of decline in just those terms with

which Insularismo is charged: "In place of a type-true people, born of and grown on the soil, there is a new sort of nomad, cohering unstably in fluid masses, the parasitical city-dweller, traditionless, utterly matter-of-fact, religionless, clever, unfruitful, deeply contemptuous of the countryman and especially that highest form of countryman, the country gentleman." This urbanized "mob" shows an "uncomprehending hostility to all the traditions representative of the Culture (nobility, church, privileges, dynasties, convention in art and limits of knowledge in science)," a "keen and cold intelligence," and habits which go "back far to quite primitive instincts and conditions" such as "wage-disputes and sports stadia."[61]

At the core of the distinction between "culture" and "civilization" -- as it is adopted by Ortega y Gasset and Pedreira from Spengler, and anticipated in a Latin American context by Rodó -- is the categorial separation of "soul" and "mind." The central question motivating Insularismo, be it recalled, was "¿existe el alma? ¿y puertorriqueña?," and the whole import of the book is to affirm the existence of a Puerto Rican "soul." And, as in Spengler, "soul" means for Pedreira precisely what is not mind, what is "forever inaccessible," in Spengler's words, "to the lucid mind, to the understanding, or to empirical, factual research... One could sooner dissect with a knife a theme by Beethoven or dissolve it with an acid than analyze the soul by means of abstract thought."[62] "Soul," in fact, is divorced not only from scientific

reason and intelligence but from the external, material world itself. It is lodged and sheltered in the "inner existence" of man, separated, as Spengler says, "from all that is real or has evolved, a very definite feeling of the most secret and genuine potentialities of his life, his destiny, his history. In the early stages of the languages of all cultures, the word soul is a sign that encompasses all that is not world."[63]

In the circumstances of a colonial society, of course, the attribution of a "soul" to the conquered people constitutes a form of resistance and defiance, since the message of the colonial missionaries was precisely the denial of "soul" among the native population. It is significant, therefore, that Pedreira's assertion of a Puerto Rican alma occurs at the outset of the chapter "afirmación puertorriqueña." The content of "soul" and "culture" in Pedreira's writings, however, and the ideological function of these concepts in Insularismo, belong not to a progressive, anti-colonialist tradition but to the trappings of apologetic bourgeois aesthetics. The most penetrating analysis of this metaphysical polarity occurs in the early essay of Herbert Marcuse, "The Affirmative Character of Culture" (1934), which was directed largely against Spengler and applies cogently to Pedreira's most heart-felt cultural assumptions:

> There is...(a) fairly widespread conception of culture, in which the spiritual world is lifted out of its social context, making culture a (false) collective noun and attributing (false) universality to it. This...concept of culture (clearly seen in such expressions as "national culture," "Germanic culture," or "Roman culture") plays off the spiritual world against the material world by holding up culture as the realm of authentic values and self-contained ends in opposition to the world of social utility and means.

> Through the use of this concept, culture is distinguished from civilization and sociologically and valuationally removed from the social process. This concept itself has developed on the basis of a specific historical form of culture, which is termed "affirmative culture" in what follows. By affirmative culture is meant that culture of the bourgeois epoch which led in the course of its own development to the segregation from civilization of the mental and spiritual world as an independent realm of value that is also considered superior to civilization. Its decisive characteristic is the assertion of a universally obligatory, eternally better and more valuable world that must be unconditionally affirmed: a world essentially different from the factual world of the daily struggle for existence, yet realizable by every individual for himself "from within," without any transformation of the state of fact. It is only in this culture that cultural activities and objects gain that value which elevates them above the everyday sphere. Their reception becomes an act of celebration and exaltation.[64]

What for Spengler, and Pedreira, would be a dynamic concept of culture is in fact a static one, isolated from the real movement of social history; what is intended as a spiritual protest against reification is a surrender to it, and the "soul" a seat of unfulfilled promises. Thus, the core chapter of Insularismo, "Afirmación puertorriqueña," turns out to be apt in an ironic, unintended sense, since rather than an anti-imperialist claim to distinct cultural identity the book rests on an "affirmative" rationalization of the cultural status quo. Lenin, it might be noted, was quick to point out the apologetic content of The Decline of the West when, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of Pravda (May 2, 1922), he proclaimed: "The old bourgeois and imperialist Europe, which was accustomed to look upon itself as the centre of the universe, rotted and burst like a putrid ulcer in the first imperialist

holocaust. No matter how the Spenglers, and all the enlightened philistines who are capable of admiring (or even studying) Spengler may lament it, this decline of the old Europe is but an episode in the history of the downfall of the world bourgeoisie, oversatiated by imperialist rapine and oppression of the majority of the world's population."[65]

Pedreira may not have been aware of the deeply reactionary implications of Spengler's theories which made him -- despite his muddled objections -- one of the undeniable spiritual fathers of German fascism.[66] He may not have recognized The Decline of the West for the sham that it was, culminating in a call for a very Western and decidedly Germanic "Caesar" to launch the new "stage" of world culture, and motivated by the kind of imperialist desperation that led its author to declare, in 1936, "Should the white peoples ever become so tired of war that their governments can no longer incite them to wage it, the earth will inevitably fall a victim to the colored man....If the white races are resolved never to wage war again, the colored will act differently and be rulers of the world."[67] This fanatical propaganda, though it derives logically from Spengler's meta-cultural morphology adopted by Pedreira, plays no part in Insularismo. Rather, the "solutions" offered by Pedreira have the ring of a more conventional cultural idealism, very reminiscent, at times, of Schiller: the path to political

freedom leads through the aesthetic, through the cultivation of Beauty and inner spiritual values.

But there is another feature of Insularismo which bears the mark, at least indirectly, of Pedreira's reading of Spengler. As Georg Lukács has pointed out, Spengler's basic degradation of science and scientific analysis led him to the explicit and methodical rejection of any sense of historical causality.[68] Instead, he chose to expound his ideas in the form of analogies and metaphorical generalities. Pedreira, too, is careful to preface his reflections by saying, "no son productos de un análisis científico" and "no perseguimos hacer historia, ni ciencia, ni labor de expertos a base de estadísticas."(9) These introductory words of caution open the door, then, to the entire barrage of analogies and speculative metaphors, all of them exempt, as it were, from the test of scientific scrutiny and responding only to "un personal desasiego, con raíces en la inquietud contemporánea." They are no more than "reflexiones provisionales," "elementos dispersos" and "semillas recién sembradas esperando que el lector las haga reventar."(17) As with Spengler, Pedreira raises the negation of method to the rank of a guiding methodological principle.

Insularismo: Interpretation or Projection?

Lukács' polemical analysis of Spengler and German irrationalism -- represented among Spanish philosophers by Ortega y Gasset -- has a more substantial relevance to a critique of Pedreira. While appearing to attack the manifestations of capitalist culture and the "mediocrity" of bourgeois democratic society, thinkers like Nietzsche, Spengler and Karl Jaspers have as their real target socialism and the working class movement. The "hidden agenda" of the cultural pessimism of Ortega y Gasset and Spengler -- and at times it is far from secret -- is dictated by their panic fear of Bolshevism and the "threat" of proletarian revolution. The ominous "mass man" and modern Caliban, when stripped of his cultural and psychological mask, is none other than the modern proletariat.

The same class motivation underlies the "interpretación puertorriqueña" of Pedreira. It is more than random coincidence that Insularismo was published in the same year as the founding of the Puerto Rican Communist Party. 1934 was also the year of the great, historic strike of the azucareros and the period of ascendancy and vast influence of the Nationalist Party. The entire period, in fact, that Pedreira bemoans as an "intermezzo" in Puerto Rican life and a detour from the course of Puerto Rican cultural destiny witnessed the growth of a militant, indigenous labor movement.[69]

What was in Pedreira's eyes the specter of "mass democracy" and materialist civilization was, according to any objective account of social history, intense imperialist oppression and the externally controlled capitalist consolidation -- and rapid proletarianization -- of the society.

Pedreira did not voice any explicit contempt for, or fear of, the Puerto Rican or North American working class, any more than he saved any kind words for the imperialist bourgeoisie or its frail colonial counterpart. Rather, he assumed a stance "above" the economic and social struggle, cursing both houses in the name of aristocratic nobility. The butt of his scorn and cultural premonition was the rise of "economic man," who would appear to embody corporate businessman and plebeian consumer alike. He was not for or against capitalism or any other economic or political arrangement as such; what he opposed was the politicization of social life and the economic, utilitarian measurement of all values. "Hoy hemos perdido el ocio creador," he complains, "porque alguien nos dijo que el tiempo es dinero."(105)

And yet, with all due reservations and qualifications, Pedreira's Insularismo remains a classic, textbook example of bourgeois ideology. His sublimated, "affirmative" concept of culture, counterpoised as it is to "civilization" and the contradictions of social production to which

it responds, is true to the letter of metaphysical aesthetic theory. By the same token, his unilateral identification of European "civilization," in the form of writing, print and formalized aesthetic norms, as the impetus to genuine cultural life constitutes but another variant of the same undialectical, bourgeois understanding of human progress. The complementarity of these seemingly diverse positions, and Pedreira's confusion about the entire relation between culture and progress, is evident when he traces his own intellectual lineage from Ortega y Gasset back to Rousseau.(98) Yet it was not an idealized, effete cultural tradition that Rousseau opposed to the reified "civilization" of modern society, but the spontaneity and organic unity with nature characteristic of primitive communal life. Of course Rousseau's vision of the "nobility" of pre-civilized man is romantic and mythical in quality, and any attempt, therefore, such as that of Gordon K. Lewis, to ground a strategy for Puerto Rican revolution in the Second Discourse, Emile and the Social Contract can only mislead and mystify the realities of the modern-day class struggle.[70] Nevertheless, a clear distinction must be drawn, and upheld, between Rousseau's radical insights, centering as they do around a critique of private property, and the heritage of existentialism, nihilism and cultural pessimism with which they are customarily associated. More than Spengler, Ortega y Gasset and Pedreira, it is Marx, Martí and Mariátegui who stand

closest to the perspective of Rousseau's criticism of modern civilization and culture.[71]

This separation of "culture" from economic and political reality has its bearing on Pedreira's understanding of Puerto Rico as a colonial nation. For, again in classical bourgeois fashion, he strives to isolate the "national culture" as the defining "essence" of Puerto Ricans, "globalmente considerados."(10) Whatever seems to involve the participation of "all" Puerto Ricans -- black or white, rich or poor, urban or rural -- stands to define the cultural personality of the nation, and serves as its main instrument of collective resistance. Thus, in his enthusiastic description of clandestine economic opposition to Spain in the 1880s, Pedreira emphasizes this total participation: "Todo Puerto Rico se estremece con esta aspiración: negros y blancos, ricos y pobres, campesinos y ciudadanos, obreros y profesionales." (184) The regressive quality of Pedreira's position is most glaring when he elevates this relatively cohesive perspective of the 19th-century movement for autonomy into an ideal for Puerto Rico well into the 20th century. The most basic Marxist understanding points up the fallacy of this unhistorical view: "In the early stages of capitalism one can still speak of a 'common culture' of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. But as large-scale industry develops and the class struggle becomes more and more acute, this 'common culture' begins to melt away. One cannot seriously speak of the 'common culture' of a nation when employers

and workers of one and the same nation cease to understand each other."[72]

Pedreira equivocates on the issue of Puerto Rico's political status, contending only that it is impossible to gain any definite orientation because the juridical questions are so confusing.(100) Nevertheless, despite this political evasion, Pedreira does advocate a position, for which Insularismo provides, in many ways, an eloquent program: the position of "cultural-national autonomy." He argues, and the kernel of his message comes out in his concluding hymn to Puerto Rican youth, that the intellectual, educational and cultural formation of the nation should be allowed to flourish and develop "freely," regardless of whether or not this process takes place under the political and economic tutelage of the United States. The consequences of this position in subsequent Puerto Rican history, with the institution of "commonwealth" status and "free associated statehood," are too familiar to require elaboration. Nor is it necessary to restate Lenin's forceful arguments against the "Bundists" in exposing the petty-bourgeois, utopian futility of the "cultural-national autonomy" of Pedreira and his many political followers, who have helped convert his vision into policy. The clearest answer to the stance of Pedreira --and it has survived as the dominant conception throughout the spectrum of Puerto Rican political life -- is that of Lenin in his discussion of "national culture":

> ....The elements of democratic and socialist culture are present, if only in rudimentary form, in every national culture, since in every nation there are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions of life inevitably give rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. But every nation also

> possesses a bourgeois culture (and most nations a reactionary and clerical culture as well) in the form, not merely of "elements", but of the dominant culture. Therefore, the general "national culture" is the culture of the landlords, the clergy and the bourgeoisie. This fundamental and, for a Marxist, elementary truth was kept in the background by the Bundist, who "drowned" it in his jumble of words, i.e., instead of revealing and clarifying the class gulf to the reader, he in fact obscured it. In fact, the Bundist acted like a bourgeois, whose every interest requires the spreading of a belief in a non-class national culture.[73]

If Pedreira's spokesmanship for the Puerto Rican nation against imperialism was equivocal, and oriented toward cultural perservation, his class partisanship was decidedly less so. His ideal of the "national culture" clearly and unflinchingly identified the criollo bourgeoisie as the defining force, often against the contaminating influence of the "vulgar" popular culture of the masses. Even economically, though, his emphasis is on the interests and mobility of the owning class, as in his admiration for the collective national involvement in the 19th-century boycott movement: "Todo Puerto Rico," his thought continues," ...se unieron estrechamente a la sombra de esta nueva masonería, que dejó prontamente sentir su influencia en el rápido florecimiento del comercio, la industria y los negocios de los nativos."(184) And it is significant that in his overly indulgent, sympathetic "revision" of Insularismo -- as mentioned, the only extended discussion of the book to date -- Maldonado-Denis interpreted Pedreira's warning words about North American "civilization" distinctly from the vantage-point of the colonial

bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie: "lo que no es controvertible," he wrote in 1962, "son las cosas que todos podemos presenciar con nuestros propios ojos: el porcentaje de las fábricas instaladas en Puerto Rico que pertenecen a entidades de la metrópoli; el surgimiento de cadenas de supermercados que amenazan la supervivencia del pequeño comerciante; la instalación de grandes tiendas por departamentos que pondrán en peligro al detallista -- no ya de víveres -- sino de ropa, zapatos, etc.; el papel preponderante que juega el capital financiero norteamericano en nuestro programa de industrialización, etcétera."[74] According to this more faithful than critical updating of Pedreira, the main threat involved in the economic saturation of the society is not so much to the working class, but to the native owners, planners and individual producers, whose "freedom" and right to "self-determination" are becoming increasingly restricted.

Now Pedreira was not speaking on behalf of the small shopkeepers or artisans in any direct sense, any more than he was siding with the local capitalists. He was a university professor and prominent intellectual, who considered his deepest concerns to lie outside of the public arena. His real class representation is betrayed not in any open political advocacy, but in the quality of his vision itself: the economic and political restrictions suffered by the colonial bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie are paralleled in the intellectual restrictedness of

Pedreira's cultural interpretation. Insularismo, according to its author, consists of no more than "personal" observations, stemming from his own "private" concerns; yet his projections, his prescriptions of educational autonomy and cultural dignity, are intended to apply to all of mankind, and to all of Puerto Rican society in particular. This endeavor to generalize a personally perceived predicament and sense of emancipation within bounds set by the very structure of society is what characterizes both representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, the "economic" and the "intellectual." Marx's portrayal of this relationship in The Eighteenth Brumaire (1852) remains resoundingly apt to an explanation of the class content of a position like that of Pedreira:

> This content is the transformation of society in a democratic way, but a transformation within the bounds of the petty bourgeoisie. Only one must not form the narrow-minded notion that the petty bourgeoisie, on principle, wishes to enforce an egoistic class interest. Rather, it believes that the special conditions of its emancipation are the general conditions within the frame of which alone modern society can be saved and the class struggle avoided. Just as little must one imagine that the democratic representatives are indeed all shopkeepers or enthusiastic champions of shopkeepers. According to their education and their individual position they may be as far apart as heaven from earth. What makes them representatives of the petty bourgeoisie is that fact that in their minds they do not go beyond the limits which the latter do not get beyond in life, that they are consequently driven, theoretically, to the same problems and solutions to which material interest and social position drive the latter practically. This is, in general, the relationship between the political and literary representatives of a class and the class they represent.[75]

"¡Que nos coge el holandés!" -- the perennial fear of Dutch pirates is Pedreira's standing symbol of Puerto Rican identity, the historical epitome, of collective "insularismo." Paralyzed by inclement atmosphere, diminutive geography and a disjointed racial fusion, Puerto Ricans are condemned to isolation from the world around them, economically, politically, intellectually and culturally. On their haunches in the face of Destiny, and wills weakened by the tropical heat, they have recourse only to optimistic metaphors and overblown rhetoric with which to "sweeten the pill" of their historical misery. And yet, is it not Pedreira himself who resorts to these devices and assumes this posture? "Inventamos sin el menor reparo," he says of his countrymen, "teorías geológicas y atmosféricas" (146), in a book which is steeped in the long-outmoded milieu theories of Taine, and which rests on intellectual improvisations like, "Nuestra temperatura nacional ha estado condicionada por climas históricos que no son tropicales." (160)

As it turns out, the metaphorical catch-phrase "insularismo" appears more a projection of Pedreira's own intellectual limitations than an appropriate characterization of Puerto Rican reality. The

solitary, insulated condition of the colony is manifest in the confining horizons of its revered intellectual spokesman. "Y esa soledad," Pedreira reflects, "mordaza del derecho, que nos amputa de los fraternos núcleos intelectuales y nos desvía de las nuevas corrientes del pensamiento que agita la conciencia del mundo, constituye aún hoy, una de las señales más represivas de nuestra cultura y un factor explicativo de nuestra personalidad carbonizada." (160) What better explanation of a writer like Pedreira himself, who in the year 1934 --between the rise of fascism and the Spanish Civil War -- could refer to the European cultural pessimists Spengler and Ortega y Gasset as "fraternos núcleos intelectuales" and continue citing the "arielistas" as "las nuevas corrientes del pensamiento que agita la conciencia del mundo"? What more apt description of Pedreira's own position than when he speaks of the chronic break-up of Puerto Rican national cohesion and solidarity: "Cuando pudimos formar la hermandad puertorriqueña, nuestro individualismo atomizante impidió siempre la cohesión, disgregándonos en pequeños grupos, sin fuerzas y sin vértebras"? (187)

Concluding Remarks: New Readings, New Tasks

It would be mistaken, and profoundly damaging to the cause of Puerto Rican liberation, to simply dismiss Insularismo as passé, as the pathetic relic of an outmoded mental disposition; and it would be facile to presume that Pedreira's negative vision may be overcome by pronouncing a bold, new "positive" image in its stead. More than a curiosity-item, Insularismo stands as the classic, and in many ways pioneering, statement on Puerto Rican national identity, in which the issue was first presented as the serious philosophical challenge that it is. The failure to give credit where it is due, and to recognize in Pedreira one of the first established intellectuals to study and document Puerto Rican culture as a national culture, would mean to abandon a dialectical approach to intellectual history. More importantly, to answer his mystifications and irrationalist distortions with polemical fanfare rather than coherent scientific analysis can only serve to bolster his prevalent ideological legacy.[76]

Nevertheless, it is clear that the historical record and the advances of modern knowledge are stacked against petty-bourgeois cultural pessimism and theories of national docility. The "new type of Puerto Rican" for whom Pedreira was groping will not follow him in his fruitless

quest for some ontological cultural "essence," nor agree with his conclusion that "la mejor manera de crearnos es padeciendo debajo del poder de la cultura." (227) The "power" of Puerto Rican culture, past, present and future, lies in its constantly changing yet inextricable relation to the struggle for independence and socialism. Emerging from historical "insularismo" involves breaking the back of colonial and imperialist rule, a task which befalls, more than any other social subject, the Puerto Rican working class and its national and international allies. Intellectually, this task entails, among other things, taking up Pedreira's Insularismo and exposing it to the light of contemporary revolutionary theory.

A perspicacious reading of Insularismo suggests, in turn, the practical social context in which the Puerto Rican people have lived, with growing frequency, since 1934 and the death of its author in 1939. Decades ago, the profound significance of this process and of the radically changing social context of migrant populations like Puerto Rican people in the United States was captured pointedly, in its elusive dialectical complexity, by Lenin in his article on "Capitalism and Workers' Immigration" (1913). His words carry a resounding relevance to the entire course of modern Puerto Rican cultural history, and lays bare the narrowness of just such an argument as that of Pedreira and his many adherents of more recent years:

> There can be no doubt that dire poverty alone compels people to abandon their native land, and that the capitalists exploit

> the immigrant workers in the most shameless manner. But only reactionaries can shut their eyes to the progressive significance of this modern migration of nations. Emancipation from the yoke of capital is impossible without the further development of capitalism, and without the class struggle that is based on it. And it is into this struggle that capitalism is drawing the masses of the working people of the whole world, breaking down the musty, fusty habits of local life, breaking down national barriers and prejudices, uniting workers from all countries....[77]

The demands and opportunities of a multinational working-class reality throw into jarring conflict many of the most cherished and assertedly essential marks of national identity. For the first time an objective setting is before us within which to unravel the mysteries and to confront the "musty fusty habits" of Pedreira's influential thinking.

The most nightmarish of Pedreira's premonitions of a commercialized and vulgarized national culture have been more than confirmed. His fears have been superseded and dwarfed. A full-scale "Latin" culture industry flourishes by debasing Puerto Rican culture and by flaunting its supposed uniqueness, all the while adulterating it and effectively assimilating it into the venomous current of North American cultural propaganda. This process has come to saturate nearly all aspects of society in Puerto Rico, an example of cultural imperialism of the most thorough and "advanced" variety. But that uneven and far-away clash of cultures can only be understood in its full magnitude when account is taken of the political and cultural life of Puerto Ricans in the metropolitan United States.

Yet as Lenin's remarks make abundantly clear, the unfolding dynamic of Puerto Rican culture, particularly as it is manifest in the North

American setting, suggests not only the most developed historical elaboration of the predicament described by Pedreira, but also the practical answer to Insularismo and "its prevailing influence." The new context allows for a totally new reading, and for an exposure of the book's glaring anachronisms and theoretical obfuscations. In the diversified cultural reality of the metropolitan class struggle, Puerto Rican national expression acts as one among many popular cultures embodying the unifying demand for political freedom. The idealized, nostalgic and myopic vision of Pedreira stands thus exposed.

The critical transvaluation of any national culture along the lines of revolutionary Marxism is a task of awesome magnitude. It involves, most obviously, a retracing of national history as the development of social production in its local particularity and on an international scale. It calls for an interpretation of culture and art at any given stage as the more or less direct expression of differing modes of production. The most basic impetus to this entire process of ongoing historical transformation is manifest as class struggle, the contradiction of property relations. Cultural life, therefore, unified as it is by expressive forms reflective of common historical experience, is at the same time divisible according to distinct creative contexts relative to the means of production.

But as crucial as this systematic sociological and economic grounding of cultural theory may be, and however iconoclastic the results of its

consistent application, it represents only a first step in overcoming the most telling weaknesses of conventional interpretations of Puerto Rican culture. For neither a materialist sociology of art nor folklore study aimed at unearthing and preserving the buried culture of the masses harbors any final assurance that the sacred reign of the "isms" may be broken, and arbitrary periodization by decades or biographical generations laid to rest once and for all.

For one thing, the very notion of "popular culture" demands historical and ideological differentiation according to the degree to which it represents an articulation of the producing class "in itself" or "for itself." That is, does its content reveal consciousness of class position? It would thereby constitute an intentional alternative and opposition to the established and official mode of the national culture. The consequences of this analytical distinction are obvious: not only does it underlie any critical assessment of the vast and growing folklore literature concerned with Puerto Rican culture; it also poses the turn-of-the-century period (1890-1920), which saw the incipient organization and artistic expression of the Puerto Rican proletariat, as the axis of Puerto Rican cultural development for very different reasons than those offered in standard historical approaches.[78]

Dialectical methods also serve to demonstrate what is perhaps the most glaring deficiency of previous study of Puerto Rican culture: the

lack of practical interpretation and evaluation of individual works of art. Conventional repertories, catalogues and summarizing of cultural currents and the reduction of Marxist aesthetics to sociological and ideological "exposure" have had the complementary ill-effect of dulling critical sensitivity to the central issue of cultural analysis: the dialectical relation of form and content. With all the effort expended on asserting the existence of a distinctive national culture and highlighting its most prominent representatives, not one work, artist or stylistic manifestation has been accorded the kind of imaginative structural and textural analysis that can warrant claim to interpretative precision and reliable evaluative conclusions. And yet -- to take literary study as an example -- until contemporary methodological insights issuing from the diverse contributions of, say, Erich Auerbach, Lucien Goldmann, Dámaso Alonso, Noël Salomon and José Antonio Portuondo are brought to bear on Puerto Rican literature and the linguistic, stylistic and thematic qualities of texts, authors and movements receive informed critical attention, what passes for literary history will remain no more than an arbitrary and repetitive string of anecdotes, homages and epithets.

Notes

1. The most influential of these statements - such as those of Eduardo Seda Bonilla and José Luis González - are included, and criticized, in the Cuaderno de cultura published by the Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (City University of New York) in 1976. The present essay is intended as a continuation of the work of the Cuaderno. Full acknowledgment is due the Culture Task Force and all the staff of the Centro for their indispensable participation in the collective development of the ideas in this paper. As for more recent approaches to Puerto Rican culture in the United States, the essay by Manuel Maldonado-Denis, "Cultura y Educación: el problema de la asimilación cultural" from his Puerto Rico y Estados Unidos: Emigración y colonialismo (Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1976), pp. 125-154, is clearly an important step forward. However, even this more developed formulation fails again to draw the conclusions which would follow from a thorough-going class analysis and internationalist perspective.

2. The most immediate and essential background for the present critique of Pedreira was a series of weekly study and discussion sessions with a group of artists, musicians and writers active in the Puerto Rican community in New York. This series was held at the Centro and at Taller Boricua from October, 1976 through May, 1977 at the initiative of the Culture Task Force. Though the cultural workers involved are not to be considered responsible for the positions assumed here, the viewpoints, experiences and artistic work of Luis Aponte, Petra Barreras del Rio, Jacki Biaggi, Roy Brown, Sandy Esteves, Joe Falcón, Victor Fragoso, José Rubén Gaztambide, Rene López, Jorge Pérez, Alan Siegel, Jorge Soto, 'akou Sundiata and José Valdez have provided an invaluable resource for an understanding of many aspects of Puerto Rican culture.

3. Pedreira, Insularismo (San Juan: Biblioteca de autores puertorriqueños, 1957), p. 160. Page references in the text are to this edition.

4. "Vision y revision de Insularismo" in Maldonado-Denis, Puerto Rico: Mito y realidad (Barcelona: Peninsula, 1969), pp. 355-66. (quote is from p. 355)

5. For a detailed account of his life and work, see Cándida Maldonado de Ortiz, Antonio S. Pedreira: Vida y Obra (Madrid: Editorial Universitaria, 1974).

6. René Marqués, Ensayos (1953-1971) (Barcelona: Editorial Antillana, 1972), pp. 151-215. It is of some importance to note that in his psychological reflections on the Puerto Rican national character Marqués takes as his point of departure and frequent source of reference the observations about Puerto Ricans by the United States literary critic Alfred Kazin. Kazin recorded these remarks, gathered during a year teaching American literature at the University of Puerto Rico (1959-60), in his article "In Puerto Rico," Commentary XXIX/2 (Feb., 1960), pp.108-114. See also the responses to Kazin by Stan Silver and Keith Botsford in "Controversy: On Puerto Rico," Commentary XXIX/5 (May, 1960), pp. 430-436. The comments by Botsford, who spent some time with Kazin during his visit, seem appropriate; Botsford found in his article "a blend of conceit and truculent provincialism, a proportion I had observed in the man before seeing it demonstrated in the article." In fact, Kazin is following directly, through probably unknowingly, in Pedreira's line of thinking in Insularismo when he says, "the Puerto Ricans live on an island in every sense of the word: they are here, and their minds don't roam around much." The familiar tones of the "ugly American" ring through, though, when he illustrates his theories by observing his students' "refusal to visualize a New England landscape or wintry weather." "It's not simply that they have not seen snow," he continues, for "neither had the young heroine of Carson McCuller's novel who so longed to see some. It's that they are here and cannot easily imagine anything too different from their island, their town." Did it ever occur to Kazin that the imagination is sometimes "limited" by what a people see fit to imagine?

7. There is a sizeable and rapidly growing literature on the Tainos, Arawaks and Antillean Indian societies. A helpful glossary of indigenous terms, which includes a bibliography of the major relevant work, is Luis Hernández Aquino, Diccionario de voces indígenas de Puerto Rico (Bilbao: Editorial Vasco Americana, 1969). Aside from the early work by Fewkes and the significant contributions by the authors mentioned, there have also been some initial attempts at a more philosophical approach; see, for example, Jalil Sued Badillo, "Ideología e historia: el tema indígena, Cuaderno de Cultura (New York: Centro de estudios puertorriqueños, 1976),

unit 2, pp. 1-27. For a first example of a Marxist, historical materialist analysis, see Francisco Moscoso, "Tributo y formación de clases en la sociedad de los Taínos de las Antillas," paper delivered at the 7th "Congreso Internacional para el Estudio de las Culturas Pre-Colombinas de las Antillas Menores," Caracas, Venezuela, 1977. See also "The History of Puerto Rico and the Theme of Our Indigenous Roots: A Critique of Jalil Sued Badillo, Cuaderno de Cultura, unit I, pp. 178-186. The statements by Marx and Engels pertaining to pre-Columbian society and the political economy of the Conquest are collected in Materiales para la historia de América Latina (Córdoba: Cuadernos de pasado y presente, 1972), pp. 21-50. The most penetrating Marxist interpretation of art in "primitive" society may be found in the still relatively unknown writings of Max Raphael (1889-1952). Of the works available in English translation from the German, see Prehistoric Cave Paintings and Prehistoric Pottery and Civilization in Egypt.

8. A forceful recent repudiation by a Latin American writer of this typical Hispanophilia may be found in Roberto Fernández Retamar, "Contra la Leyenda Negra," Casa de las Américas XVI/99 (November - December, 1976), 28-41.

9. For a critique of Pedreira's dismissal of the early centuries of colonial rule, see the unpublished Master's dissertation by José Manuel Torres Santiago, Una interpretación social y política de los antecedentes de la poesía puertorriqueña en los siglos 16, 17 y 18 (State University of New York at Buffalo, n.d.), esp. pp. 1-19. See also José Luis González, Literatura y sociedad en Puerto Rico: De los cronistas de Indias a la generación del '98 (Mexico: Fondo de cultura económica, 1976), pp. 15-16.

10. Martí, Obras completas. (Caracas: 1964), III, p. 107.

11. Ibid., p. 110.

12. Pedreira, Obras completas (San Juan: Instituto de cultura puertorriqueñas, 1970), II, pp. 7-552. See especially the first chapter, "La introducción de la imprenta en Puerto Rico," pp. 27-38. See also note 20 below.

13. Manrique Cabrera, Historia de la literatura puertorriqueña (Rio Piedras: Editorial cultural, 1971); González, op. cit., note 9 above.

14. Febvre, The Coming of the Book (London: New Left Books, 1976), p. 207.

15. Franco, "Dependency Theory and Literary History: The Case of Latin America," Minnesota Review, 5 (1975), 65-80. (quote from p. 68).

16. Ibid., 69.

17. Hauser, Mannerism: The Crisis of Renaissance and the Origin of Modern Art (New York: Knopf, 1965), see especially "Alienation as the Key to Mannerism," pp. 94-114.

18. Capital (New York: Modern Library 1906), I, p. 839. (The second passage is a quote, cited in Capital, from Wage-Labor and Capital).

19. Quoted in Karl Marx on Colonialism and Modernization, ed. Shlomo Avineri (Garden City: Anchor 1969), p. 36.

20. Tapia y Rivera, Mis Memorias (San Juan: Editorial San Juan, 1973), p. 10. The most scrupulous account of the various conflicting theories as to the precise date and nature of the arrival of the press to Puerto Rico appears in the first chapter of Pedreira's El Periodismo en Puerto Rico. Over against the version of Tapia y Rivera (which is based, in turn, on José Julian Acosta's notes to the first history of the colony, Iñigo Abbad's Historia Geográfica de Puerto Rico) to the effect that the first press was brought to the Island by Juan Rodríguez Calderón in 1808, the later historians Eduardo Neumann, Cayetano Coll y Toste and Salvador Brau contend that it was not even a Spaniard but a Frenchman named Delarue who introduced the press in the year of 1806. Pedreira's summary of this debate, and the whole of El periodismo en Puerto Rico, demonstrate an admirable sense of scholarly objectivity and thoroughness. But because his theoretical framework

remains that defined in Insularismo, to which constant reference is made throughout, Pedreira's history of the press lacks any analysis of the real meaning of print culture to the overwhelmingly illiterate colonial society, and particularly its relation to antecedent and alternative means of communication.

21. La peregrinación de Bayoán (San Juan: Instituto de cultura puertorriqueña, 1970), p. 42.

22. Mariátegui, Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana. (Santiago, Chile: Editorial universitaria, 1955), pp. 28-9. It might be noted that one need not even turn to the brilliant revolutionary criticism of Mariátegui to recognize the leading role of Peruvian writers - from Garciloso de la Vega to Manuel González Prada to César Vallejo - in the integration of Indian experience and expression into the modern cultural struggle. The leading liberal intellectual and pedagogical thinker of early 20th century Peru, Manuel Vicente Villarán, also upheld a very powerful and unflinching demand for justice toward the Indian people and heritage. See the excellent summary of Villarán's position in Leopoldo Zea, Dos etapas del pensamiento en hispanoamérica: del positivismo al romanticismo (México: Colegio de México, 1949), pp. 249-52.

23. The evidence provided by Francisco Moscoso, op. cit. (note 7 above) of the emergence of class relations in Taino society does not contradict the basic lines of this argument.

24. This and the following passages from the chronicles are quoted in the first chapter ("The Discovery of the New World in the Imagination of Europe") of Pedro Henríquez Ureña's Literary Currents in Hispanic America (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945), pp. 6, 11 and 13 respectively. See also Bartolomé de las Casas, The Devastation of the Indies: A Brief Account (New York: Seabury, 1974), especially the introduction by Hans Magnus Enzensberger, "Las Casas, or A Look Back into the Future," pp.3-34. Another relevant recent essay is Julio Le Riverend, "Problemas históricos de la conquista; Las Casas y su tiempo," Casa de las Américas, XV/85 (July - August, 1974), 4-15.

25. Franco, op. cit. (note 15), p. 70.

26. See, for example, Pedro C. Escabí and Elsa M. Escabí, La décima: Estudio etnográfico de la cultura popular de Puerto Rico. (Puerto Rico: Editorial Universitaria, 1976), which includes an estensive bibliography. Other relevant references include Marcelino Canino Salgado, El Cantar folklórico de Puerto Rico (Puerto Rico: Editorial universitaria, 1975); Eloisa Rivera Rivera, La Poesía en Puerto Rico antes de 1843 (San Juan: Instituto de cultura puertorriqueña, 1965); Cesareo Rosa-Nieves, ed., Antología de décimas cultas de Puerto Rico (San Juan: Editorial Cordillera, 1971); and Guajana, II/10 (April - June, 1968).

27. Tomás Blanco, "Elogio de 'La plena'," Revista del Ateneo puertorriqueño, I (1935), 97-106. (quote from p. 103)

28. On the beginnings of Puerto Rican working-class organization and literary expression, see the ground-breaking paper by Ricardo Campos Orta, "Apuntes sobre la expresión cultural obrera en Puerto Rico," presented at the "Conferencia de histeografía puertorriqueña" held in April, 1974 under the sponsorship of the Centro de estudios puertorriqueños.

29. Ong, The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History (New Haven: Yale, 1967), p. 30. (Quoted, Franco, op. cit., 69-70).

30. For a summary of racial theorizing in Latin American writing, see Jean Franco, The Modern Culture of Latin America: Society and the Artist (Middlesex: Penguin, 1970), pp. 55-61. See also César Graña, "Cultural Nationalism: The Idea of Historical Destiny in Spanish America," Social Research, XXIX (Winter, 1962), 395-418. On race relations and racial thinking in Puerto Rican history, see Luis M. Diaz Soler, Historia de la esclavitud en Puerto Rico (1493-1890) (Rio Piedras: Editorial universitaria, 1970), and Isabelo Zenón Cruz, Narciso descubre su tesoro: El negro en la cultura puertorriqueña (Humacao: Editorial Furidi, 1874).

31. For an exhaustive Marxist critique of Sarmiento's racist ideas, both in Conflicto y harmonías and in his early masterpiece Vida de Juan Facundo Quirogo: Civilización y barbarie (1845), see Roberto Fernández Retamar, "Algunos usos de civilización y barbarie," Casa de las Américas, XVII/102 (May-June, 1977), 29-52. See also Ezequiel Martínez Estrada, Sarmiento (Buenos Aires: Biblioteca Argos, 1946).

32. Manrique Cabrera, op. cit. (note 11), p. 175. Significantly, Pedreira's geographic and "atmospheric" determinism also has its forebears in Puerto Rican literature, notably in the famous stanza of Gautier Benítez in his "Canto a Puerto Rico"(1873):

> Todo es en ti voluptuoso y leve,
> dulce, apacible, halagador y tierno,
> y tu mundo moral su encanto debe
> al dulce influjo de tu mundo externo.

Here again, recent Puerto Rican criticism has accepted favorably this manner of "natural" attribution. In mounting a defense of the verisimilitude and exact faithfulness of Gautier Benítez' evocations of the Puerto Rican landscape, José Luis González cites these very lines when he contends, "si algo distingue de manera inequívoca al paisaje tropical puertorriqueño del de otras parejas latitudes, es precisamente aquello que Gautier señala, con insuperable exactitud, en una cuarteta del 'Canto a Puerto Rico'..." (literatura y sociedad, p. 121). It seems the Marxist writer was so enchanted by the seductive beauty of the romantic poet's verse that he failed to take account of the apology for colonial domination which make up the immediate context within the poem. The entire "Canto a Puerto Rico" appears in Gautier Benítez, Vida y obra poética (Rio Piedras: Editorial Edil, 1970), pp. 213-219.

33. Zeno Gandía, La charca (San Juan: Instituto de cultura puertorriqueña, 1975), p. 24.

34. Quoted in Michael Banton and Jonathan Harwood, The Concept of Race (New York: Praeger, 1975), p. 41. For the backgound of racial thinking in the United States during the 19th century, see John S. Haller, Jr., Outcasts from Evolution: Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority, 1859-1900 (Chicago: University of Illinois, 1971).

35. Obras completas, III, p. 112. See also Martí's articles on "la cuestión racial," ibid., II, pp. 484-496.

36. Blanco, op. cit., p. 100.

37. Hostos, Obras completas (San Juan: Editorial Coquí, 1969), VII,pp. 152-155. "El Cholo," along with Hostos' revealing critique (1886) of Ricardo Palma's Tradiciones peruanas, appears in Masterpieces of Spanish American Literature, ed. Angel Flores and Helene M. Anderson (New York: Macmillan, 1974), I, pp. 246-53.

38. Rodó, Ariel, ed. Gordon Brotherston (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 25-6.

39. Sánchez, Balance y liquidación del Novecientos: Tuvimos maestros en nuestra América? (Lima, 1968), p. 107. Other writings on Rodó and "Arielismo" include Martin S. Stabb, In Quest of Identity: Patterns in the Spanish-American Essay of Ideas (Chapel Hill, 1967), pp. 35-46; Hugo Torrans, Rodó: Accion y libertad (Montevideo, 1973); and Víctor Pérez Petit, Rodó: Su vida-Su obra (Montevideo, 1937).

40. On Rodó's background for the"Ariel" myth, see Roberto Fernández Retamar, Caliban: Apuntes sobre la cultura en nuestra América (México: Diogenes, 1972), pp. 18-25. Calibán originally appeared in Casa de las Américas, XII/68 (September - October, 1971), 124-151. See also Gordon Brotherston's introduction to Ariel, op. cit., pp. 1-19.

41. Brotherston, p. 15. For this historical assessment of Rodó, see Fernández Retamar, pp. 31-34 and Mario Benedetti, Genio y figura de José Enrique Rodó (Buenos Aires, 1966).

42. Quoted by Fernández Retamar, Calibán, p. 22. The evidence of Rodó's explicit debt to Groussac is cited by Brotherston, p. 13.

43. Ariel, pp. 68-9.

44. Quoted in Stabb, op. cit. (note 39), pp. 42-43.

45. Vasconcelos, Obras completas (Mexico: Libreros mexicanos, 1958), II, p. 941.

46. Fernández Retamar, Calibán, pp. 30-31. For a further elaboration of the analysis in Calibán, see Fernández Retamar's important recent essays, "Algunos usos de civilización y barbarie," loc. cit. (note 31 above) and "Nuestra América y Occidente," Casa de las Américas, XVI/98 (September - October, 1976), 36-57.

47. See, for example, Jean Franco, The Modern Culture of Latin America, pp. 225-6.

48. Quoted Franco, ibid., p. 226.

49. See, for example, Manuel Maldonado-Denis, "Ortega y Gasset and the Theory of the Masses," Western Political Quarterly, XIV/3 (September - December, 1961), 676-690. Another example of an uncritical presentation of Ortega's ideas by an influential Puerto Rican intellectual is Jaime Benítez, Political and Philosophical Theories of José Ortega y Gasset (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965). More critical assessments may be found, for example in Michael Harrington, The Accidental Century (New York: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 213-19 and Raúl Roa, "Dichos y hechos de Ortega y Gasset, Cuadernos Americanos, LXXXV/1 (January - April, 1956), 130-1.

50. Maldonado Denis, "Ortega y Gasset and the Theory of the Masses," 680

51. The two statements by Ortega y Gasset are quoted in Robert McClintock, Man and His Circumstances: Ortega as Educator (New York: Columbia, 1971), pp. 199 and 201 respectively.

52. Quoted by Maldonado-Denis, "Ortega y Gasset and the Theory of the Masses," pp. 678-82.

53. Ortega y Gasset, La rebelión de las masses (Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe, 1946), pp. 103-4.

54. Ibid., p. 79

55. Ibid., p. 104

56. Llorens Torres, Obras completas (San Juan, Instituto de cultura puertorriqueña, 1975), I, pp. 290-291.

57. Geigel-Polanco, "La nacionalidad puertorriqueña," Ateneo puertorriqueño, II/2 (1936), 87-93.

58. Spengler, The Decline of the West (New York: Knopf, 1962), p. 97

59. Ibid., p. 74

60. Ibid., p. 73

61. Ibid., p. 25

62. Quoted in Herbert Marcuse, Negations: Essays in Critical Theory (Boston: Beacon, 1968), p. 107

63. Ibid., p. 108

64. Ibid., p. 95

65. Lenin, Collected Works (Moscow: Progress, 1964), XXXIII, pp. 349-50.

66. This claim is upheld, for example, in the balanced study by H. Stuart Hughes, Oswald Spengler: A Critical Estimate (New York: Scribner's, 1952), pp. 132-3. See also Fritz Stern, The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic ideology (Garden City: Anchor, 1965), pp. 246 and 293-4.

67. Spengler, Selected Essays (Chicago, 1967), pp. 206-7.

68. Lukács, Von Nietzsche zu Hitler oder Der Irrationalismus und die deutsche Politik (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1966), esp. "Kriegs-und Nachkriegszeit (Spengler)," pp. 149-161.

69. See among the growing literature on the history of the class struggle in Puerto Rico, the writings of Angel C. Quintero Rivera: Lucha obrera en Puerto Rico: Antología de grandes documentos en la historia obrera puertorriqueña (C.E.R.E.P., 1971); "La clase obrera y el proceso político en Puerto Rico," Revista de ciencias sociales, XVII/ 1-2 (March - June, 1974), 145-198; "El Partido Socialista y la lucha política triangular de las primeras décadas bajo la dominación norteamericana," Revista de ciencias sociales, XIX/1 (March, 1975), 47-100. See also Ricardo Campos and Frank Bonilla, "Industrialization and Migration: Some Effects on the Puerto Rican Working Class," Latin American Perspectives, III/3 (Summer, 1976), 66-108. For a first study of the cultural expression of the Puerto Rican working class in the formative years (1890-1930), reference is again made to the essay by Ricardo Campos Orta (note 28 above).

70. Gordon K. Lewis, Notes on the Puerto Rican Revolution: An Essay on American Dominance and Caribbean Resistance (New York: Monthly Review, 1974), pp. 227-30.

71. The relation between Rousseau and the tradition of Marxist theory is most cogently discussed in Lucio Colletti, From Rousseau to Lenin (New York: Monthly Review, 1973). Rousseau's importance within a broad revolutionary anthropological framework is presented in Stanley Diamond, In Search of the Primitive (New Brunswick, N.J., 1974).

72. Selections from Lenin and Stalin On National Colonial Question (Calcutta, 1970), p. 84. For an excellent recent discussion of the Marxist theory of national culture, see Nils Castro, "Cultura nacional y cultura socialista," Casa de las Américas, XVII/101 (March - April, 1977), 63-90.

73. Lenin, Collected Works, XX, p. 24.

74. Maldonado-Denis, loc. cit. (note 4 above), 363-4. It must be recognized that Maldonado-Denis has gone a long way toward repudiating this class position in more recent writings; see for example, his "Aproximación crítica al fenómeno nacionalista en Puerto Rico", Casa de las Américas, XVII/102 (May - June, 1977), 13-28.

75. Quoted in Marx and Engels on Literature and Art, ed. Lee Baxandall and Stefan Morawski (New York: International General, 1974), pp. 84-5.

76. Such is the tendency in the only other critical discussion of Insularismo to date, aside from that of Maldonado-Denis: Juan Angel Silén's chapter, "The Literature of Docility," in his popular nationalist history, We, the Puerto Rican People (Hacia una visión positiva del puertorriqueño, 1970). While the radical tenor and militant spirit of Silén's polemic are certainly welcome and his position well-taken, the inadequate ideological perspective lends his argument greater rhetorical than analytical or political, strategic value. A broader framework for a critique of Insularismo is suggested in José Luis Méndez, "Problemas de la creación cultural en el Caribe," Casa de las Américas, XV/85 (July - August, 1974), 27-39.

77. Collected Works, XIX, p. 454.

78. Reference is again made to the important study of Puerto Rican working-class culture by Ricardo Campos Orta, note 28 above. A valuable critique of conventional folklore study may be found in Rogelio Martínez Furé, "Folklore: Another Revolutionary Struggle," Canto Libre, II/2 (1975), 3-34.